

Forty-Seventh
Anniversary Conference

NASPA

(The Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs
founded in 1919.)

SHERATON-PARK HOTEL
Washington, D.C.

APRIL 4-7, 1965

P R O C E E D I N G S

FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

NASPA

(The Association of Deans and Administrators
of Student Affairs founded in 1919.)

Officers of the Association 1964-65

PresidentVictor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Director
of Student Personnel,
St. Peter's College
President DesignateGlen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students,
Hunter College
Vice PresidentJohn L. Blackburn, Dean of Men,
University of Alabama
Vice PresidentRobert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students,
Miami University
Vice President Designate.A. T. Brugger, Dean of Men,
University of California
Vice President Designate.David W. Robinson, Dean of Student
Affairs, Emory University
Secretary-TreasurerCarl W. Knox, Dean of Men,
University of Illinois
Conference ChairmanO. D. Roberts, Dean of Men,
Purdue University
Conference Chairman
Designate.....Thomas A. Emmet, Dean of McNichols
Evening Division, University
of Detroit
Placement OfficerRichard E. Hulet, Dean of Students,
Illinois State University
HistorianFred H. Turner, Dean of Students,
University of Illinois

Executive Committee: The Officers and

James C. McLeodDean of Students, Northwestern
University
Earle W. CliffordDean of Student Affairs, Rutgers
University
Alan W. JohnsonDean of Students, University of
Houston
G. Robert RossDean of Student Affairs, University
Nebraska
Richard Siggelkow, Dean of Students, State University
Editor of New York
Mark SmithDean of Men, Denison University
Kenneth R. Venderbush ...Dean of Men, Lawrence College

NOTE: The material in this book is a transcribed account of
the proceedings of the annual meeting. The contents are
reproduced as they were transcribed without the benefit of
editing or rewriting.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Name of the Association: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Address: Secretary-Treasurer, Dean Carl W. Knox, 157 Administration Building, Urbana, Illinois.

Purpose of the Association: The purpose of the Association is to discuss and study the most effective methods of aiding students in their intellectual, social, moral, and personal development.

"The institutions which are the constituent members of the Association are represented by those who are primarily concerned with the administration of student personnel programs in colleges and universities of the United States and Canada. Recognizing that many specialized abilities contribute to meeting student needs, this Association seeks to provide and stimulate leadership for the effective combination and utilization of all of these resources.

"As the student personnel program is affected by and affects the entire educational endeavor, this Association cooperates with those agencies and associations which represent higher education, government, community resources, and specialized interests in student personnel work."
(Article II of the Constitution)

Brief History of the Association: The Association was founded in 1919 by Dean Thomas Arkle Clark, University of Illinois, and Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin. The first meeting was held at the University of Wisconsin in 1919, and the second at Illinois in 1920. The original organization adopted the name, The National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, and this title was continued until the 33rd Anniversary Conference at St. Louis, Missouri, in 1951, when the title was changed to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

The Association has a long record of cooperative activities with other associations and has taken the lead in some inter-association activities. It has repeatedly surveyed itself on functions -- in 1925, 1928, 1939, 1940, and 1944. Since 1935, the Association has operated a Placement Service available to member institutions.

The publications of the Association have been the Annual Proceedings which are verbatim reports of all conferences since 1919, and a monthly News Letter from the Secretary to all member institutions. Two years ago the Association began publication of a professional Journal. It is making a significant contribution through its articles of timely interest, book reviews, and communications to the membership.

The Work of the Association is done by the Annual Conference and Executive Committee and various committees and commissions. In 1965, active commissions are devoted to professional relations, legal principles and problems, in service education, professional preparation, student financial aids, fraternity relations, educational facilities and the study commission on the student and social issues. This last commission is making a study of many of these issues as they relate to student freedoms and responsibilities. Their first report will be featured at this 47th Conference. There are numerous ad hoc and permanent committees devoted to special areas of interest. Since 1925, the Association has worked in cooperation with practically every recognized association of higher education, and in 1938, called the initial meeting with eight other groups seeking to coordinate and improve inter-association relationships. An outstanding activity began in 1954, when the Commission on Development and Training in cooperation with the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and with Foundation support, conducted national regional studies at the Business School and regionally with the Business School faculty in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957. For the third consecutive year, just prior to the Anniversary Conference NASPA's Commission III is holding a two day training seminar which will have some eighty personnel workers in attendance.

Membership: From the start the Association adopted the policy of institutional rather than individual memberships and this was formalized in a constitution adopted in 1932. Memberships in the Association are institutional with the official representative designated by the institution. In 1964, this institutional membership was supplemented by adding individual memberships. The official representative designated by the institution is the voting delegate. Other members from the professional staff of the member institutions are designated as institutional delegates. An associate category was added to accommodate interested persons from other associations. Four year degree granting educational institutions approved by their regional accrediting bodies are eligible for membership. There were 447 member institutions in 1965, representing institutions in fifty states, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

The historical material in this statement was prepared by our historian, Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
Officers and Executive Committee	1
Statement of Principles	11
GREEN RIBBON MEETING	
Sunday - April 4, 1965	
Welcome and Opening Remarks -	
Chairman David W. Robinson	1
Self-introduction of each	
person in attendance	2
Greetings -	
President Yanitelli	2
NASPA History - Dean Fred H. Turner ...	3
Placement Service - Dean Hulet	8
Introduction of Subjects of the	
Conference - Chairman Robinson	10
Announcements	19
DINNER MEETING	
Sunday - April 4, 1965	
Invocation -	
Dr. William Stuart Nelson	19
Introductions -	
Dr. Armour J. Blackburn	20
FIRST GENERAL SESSION	
Sunday - April 4, 1965	
Chairman - Glen Nygreen	23
Invocation - Dean Arden O. French	23
Welcome - Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr.	24
Entertainment - Howard University Choir	27
President's Address -	
Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.	29
SECOND GENERAL SESSION	
Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - President Yanitelli	35
Commission VIII Report - "What	
Freedoms Do Students Enjoy" -	
E. G. Williamson	35
John Cowan	42
Announcements	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Monday - April 5, 1965

Conference Announcements	52
Chairman - President Yanitelli	52
Panel of Commission VIII -	
Dr. Barbara Kirk	53
Dr. Martha Peterson	55
Father Andrew Greely	58
Dr. Phillip Monypenny	63
Mr. Stephen J. M. Robbins	68
Announcements	74

LUNCHEON - SMALL COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

Monday - April 5, 1965

Chairman - David L. Harris	75
Address -	
Dr. Hugh Borton	76
Announcements	85

SEMINAR - "Concepts of Freedom"

Monday - April 5, 1965

Chairman - Dean Peter H. Armacost	86
Speaker -	
Dr. Harry D. Gideonse	87

SEMINAR - "Fraternities and the Student

Personnel Administrator -- The Crucial Issues"

Monday - April 5, 1965

Chairman - Dean William R. Nester	
Speaker -	
Roland Patzer	96
Reactors -	
Dean Hadley DePuy	106
Mr. Robert Krovitz	109
Dean John Feldkamp	112
Mr. Richard Fletcher	114
Discussion	117

SEMINAR - "Freedom of the Student Press"

Monday - April 5, 1965

Chairman - Dean William B. Crafts	119
Speaker - Dean James R. Kreuzer	120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
SEMINAR - "Professional Preparation for Student Personnel Service" Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - Dean Richard F. Gross	128
Speakers -	
Dean Miriam Shelden	129
Dr. Robert Stripling	133
Reactors:	
Dean Glen Nygreen	138
Dean Robert F. Etheridge	141
SEMINAR - "Student Participation in Policy and Decision Making" Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - Merrill Beyerl	143
Speaker - Dr. Joseph F. Kauffman	144
SEMINAR - "Legal Due Process and Student Rights" Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - Dean Thomas J. Edwards	150
Speaker - William J. Van Alstyne	152
SEMINAR - "Student Financial Aid -- Packaged Pressure" Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - William H. Knapp	165
Members of Panel -	
Jack Critchfield	166
James L. Bowman	172
William Van Dusen	175
James L. Moore	181
SEMINAR - "Student Demonstrations" Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - James M. Lavin	186
Speaker - Daniel H. Pollitt	187
Discussion	197
FOURTH GENERAL SESSION Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - A. T. Brugger	211
"Freedom Through Education" -	
Speaker - E. G. Williamson	212
Paper - George Shuster	216

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
SPECIAL SESSION - RESTRUCTURING	
Monday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - A. T. Brugger	224
Discussion	224
FIFTH GENERAL SESSION	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - William H. Knapp	234
"Congress and Financial Aid to the College and University Student" Address - Congresswoman Edith Green	235
ASSOCIATION BUSINESS MEETING	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - President Yanitelli	246
Reports -	
Conference Chairman O.D. Roberts	246
Pre-Conference Seminar - Dean Brown .	247
Committees - Vice President Blackburn	248
Commissions - Vice Pres. Etheridge ..	250
Secretary-Treasurer - Carl W. Knox ..	252
Expression of Thanks -	
President Yanitelli	255
Proposals for NASPA Reorganization	256
Resolutions re Implementation	270
Report of Committee on Nominations -	
Past President Hocutt	271
Election	272
Recommendation re	
Pre-Conference Seminars -	
Dean Beatty	272
Vote of Commendation and Thanks	273
SEMINAR - "College Unions"	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - John W. Truitt	274
Speaker - Edward Malloy	274

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
SEMINAR - "Speaker Policies and Practices"	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - Edwin M. Gaines	284
Speaker - Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J. .	284
SEMINAR - "Council of Student Personnel Associations"	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - Kenneth R. Venderbush	295
Speakers -	
J. C. Clevenger	296
Joseph F. Kauffman	305
Discussion	311
SEMINAR - "National Associations for Student Government"	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - Earle W. Clifford	316
Panel Members -	
Nano Byrnes	317
Thomas D. Johnson	319
Stephen J. M. Robbins	321
Sally Jo Vasicko	325
Jon D. Mastin	326
Discussion	329
SEMINAR - "Use and Misuse of Sedatives and Stimulating Drugs"	
Tuesday - April 5, 1965	
Chairman - John Gwin	336
Panel Members -	
Dr. Howard I. Weinstein	338
Dr. Norman Alberstadt	340
Douglas Hansen	346
Alvin Gottlieb	352
Morris Yakowitz	358
Discussion	354
CONFERENCE BANQUET	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Chairman - President Yanitelli	362
Invocation - Philip Price	362
Introductions	363
Resolutions - Dean Turner	364
Entertainment - George Washington University Singing Group	366

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
CONFERENCE BANQUET (Continued)	
Tuesday - April 6, 1965	
Address -	
Lawrence Dennis	367
Presentation of Gavel to	
President Nygreen	382
Adjournment	384
FUTURE CONFERENCE DATES	384
APPENDIX A	
Report of the Secretary	385
Interim Treasurer's Report	386
APPENDIX B	
Commissions and Committees	
(As taken from the Program	388
Directorships	395
1965 Conference Committee Chairmen ...	396
APPENDIX C	
Roster of Members	398
Institutional Delegates	409
Associate	416
Student Affiliates	418
APPENDIX D	
Attendance 47th Conference	420
Guests and Program Participants	435
APPENDIX E	
Summary of Previous Meetings	440

GREEN RIBBON MEETING
Sunday - April 4, 1965

The Green Ribbon Meeting of the 47th Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, held April 4-7, 1965, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., convened at two o'clock in the Park Ballroom, Vice President Designate David W. Robinson, Dean of Student Affairs, Emory University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Following the tradition of NASPA we will try to start the meeting as closely as we can to the starting time. I presume more people will come in, but we will just play it by ear and go along.

I would like to extend greetings to our lady and gentlemen. This is the Green Ribbon session, which is designed with just a couple of purposes or objectives in mind: First, that of having the men and ladies new to the Association meet each other, and see and meet some of the officers of the Association; secondly, to give you a little background of NASPA, and a preview of coming attractions for the convention.

Taking these in order, there are several members of the Executive Committee who are here. Those Executive Committee members who are here, if you would all stand, please let me introduce you, and just remain standing until the introductions are done so that your attractive countenance can be burned into the thought processes of our new, young friends. Let me introduce these people.

You will be greeted in a moment by our President Victor R. Yanitelli, Father Yanitelli, St. Peter's College.

You will not be greeted, but you will be hearing quite a bit from our new President, Dean Nygreen, Hunter College of New York.

Other members of the Executive Committee who are here: From my left, you will hear from Dean Fred Turner, Illinois; Dick Hulet from Illinois State University; Jim McLeod, Past President; our very hard working editor of the NASPA Journal, Dick Siggelkow; Mark Smith, our small in stature young man -- stand up, Mark -- member of the Executive Committee. The gentleman over there at the side, our really hard working Secretary-Treasurer, Dean Carl Knox from Illinois. I believe that is all of the members of the Executive Committee here today.

Next I would like to have you just spend a minute, if you would. We were deciding whether or not we would have you folks introduce yourselves as a group or by individuals. I think we will have time (parenthetically, I might say this is a one-hour meeting, and at three o'clock we will break

up), but if you would, it is a pleasant experience if each of you would stand up and very briefly give your name and your school. We will just go right down this side, and over the left side.

... Each individual in attendance arose, and gave his name, position, and affiliation ...

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: A couple more members of the Executive Committee walked in: John Blackburn, University of Alabama, and Bob Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University; Kan Venderbush, Dean of Men, Lawrence College; Alan Johnson, Dean of Students, University of Houston.

The President of our Association I will introduce as Father Victor R. Yanitelli. He will quickly become to you, as he is to those of us who know him, a friend and one to whom you will refer as Father Vic, like the rest of us. It is very easy for us -- even the Methodists -- to refer to Father Yanitelli in this very friendly manner, yet respecting his position in his church, as Father Vic.

Father Vic, I do not know how many of the group here are represented in your religion, but I would like to introduce you to your flock of new NASPA people. Father Vic. (Applause)

PRESIDENT VICTOR R. YANITELLI, S.J. (President of NASPA; Director of Student Personnel, St. Peter's College): Thank you very much, Dave. I am most grateful for that introduction, and also that you said it would be brief.

I do not know how many of you were at the pre-conference seminar, but what I said basically there was that you are most welcome to this Association, and if there is any association on the face of this earth that has an open heart and open arms for new members -- medium members, tall, short, fat, wide, slim members -- it is NASPA. I wish you would take a look at the people who are wearing the Executive ribbons, knock them down, talk to them, get involved with them. You will always find a welcome.

It is good to have you aboard. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: There are no old men in NASPA, but there are some grand men in NASPA. In my estimation Fred Turner is the grandest of the grand men. I will have to admit that there are some who are pretty close to him, but he still stands out as number one.

Fred is a Past President; he was Executive Secretary of the Association for more than two decades; he is now our Historian. Dean Fred Turner, University of Illinois. (Applause)

DEAN FRED H. TURNER ("History of NASPA;" Dean of Students, University of Illinois): Dave, and Ladies and Gentlemen: You know it is difficult for a man to take a spot such as I have and know that he has only ten minutes to use and try to say in the ten minutes the things I will say to you.

As a matter of fact, I have an inclination to add things into the reference to Father Vic, and I might recall a story that is well worth telling to you because of the thing it represents.

The first member of the Jesuit group ever to come with us was Father Joe Rock. At that time he was here in Washington, but Joe is still alive and is Graduate Dean at Scranton at the present time. Joe came with us for several years by himself. Then he began to bring a friend or two along. Finally in 1954, when we were meeting down in Roanoke, Virginia, there was a special meeting of the Jesuit Deans of their own members. They had a meeting and when we came to the final business session, the President of the Association turned to Joe and said, "Joe, is there a report to be made from the Jesuit Deans?"

Father Rock said, "No, there is no report. We have had a meeting, and there will not be any further reports from the Jesuit Deans, for the simple reason that we will be meeting as members of the group and not having separate meetings of our own. We feel we should not take the time for a meeting of our own; we should be with the rest of the group."

I think the only reason that the Jesuits have met separately from us from time to time has been because they had religious obligations which they felt they must fulfill. This represents something to me, the fact that here was a fellowship from these good men from the church who found, after having some meetings of their own, that they wanted to join with this entire group, not just have a meeting of their own and keep it separate from the rest of the group.

There goes about two minutes of my time. (Laughter)
But I will pick it up in some way.

This is an old Association. I was going to read one little item. Most of you see the NASPA publication, but here is an item I want to read to you. This is a quote:

"The only definite objective of this organization, so far as I can learn, is freedom of speech in the universities. 'Freedom of speech' as they apparently interpret it is absolute license to say what they please, when they please, where they please, and how they please. Whether or not the statements are based on facts or the subjects are appropriate for the publications in which they are printed does not seem to enter into the question.

"This feeling of a desire for freedom from all

restraint has almost reached the point of an obsession with some of the leaders of the movement. In their desire to secure what they call 'academic freedom,' they advocate 'faculty and student representation on the board of trustees' and in order to fit the curriculum to present 'social needs,' they propose appointing student committees to revise the curriculum.

"The impression one gains from all of this is that in the opinion of youth, or at least of these youths, all college administrators are backward and reactionary in their ideas and policies, that the only hope for the future of our educational institutions is to turn over the control of them to these young people."

In 1965? No, 1923. This was a statement made by Dean Joseph M. Bursley, of the University of Michigan at the fifth NADAM meeting at Purdue University in 1923. So there is nothing very new about some of the things you are hearing these days.

The point is, the Historian has an interesting place in the organization. Those people who are interested in historical things find lots of interesting things. Those who do not are bored with them. You can take your choice on these.

This Association was founded in 1919 at the University of Wisconsin. Dean Thomas Arkle Clark of the University of Illinois and Scott Goodnight of the University of Wisconsin corresponded all during the first World War and when it ended, November 11, 1918, the institutions were loaded with problems and Deans Clark and Goodnight had been corresponding about their mutual problems, and finally said, it would be a good idea to get together and talk about our mutual problems. So they did. They arranged a meeting up in Madison, January 24-25, 1919.

The people who attended this first meeting were Dean Goodnight of Wisconsin, Dean Rienow of the University of Iowa, Dean Nicholson of the University of Minnesota, Dean L. I. Reed of Iowa State Teachers College at Cedar Rapids, Professor L. A. Strauss of the University of Michigan, and Professor M. W. Smallwood of Syracuse University. Dean Clark got the flu and was not able to go to the first meeting.

In 1933 we were able to dig up the complete record of that first meeting, and it is published in the 1933 Bulletin, the yearbook for 1933. We have the minutes of the first and second meetings, so that we do have that complete record.

The second meeting was held at Illinois the following year, 1920. I was an office boy in Dean Clark's office at the time. I emptied ash trays and ran errands for them at the time this meeting was being held. There were eleven men there; it includes Stanley Coulter who had just been made Dean at Purdue, and Joe Bursley from Michigan.

The next meeting, the third, was held in Iowa City in 1921 with sixteen men present. The fourth at Lexington, Kentucky, in 1922, with twenty men present. I attended my first meeting in Ann Arbor in 1924, with twenty-nine men in attendance. We sat around one table in the new Michigan Union and talked about things. At that meeting they had the first representative from an eastern school, Howard McClenahan, from Princeton University. He was the first man from an eastern school to come to this group in the midwest.

I think you might be interested in the topics these men talked about in the 1924 meeting, because there is a certain freshness about them. These were papers that were presented, and then they discussed the papers.

Dean Goodnight of Wisconsin talked about how a Dean of Men can serve the university and what are the principal and typical functions of the Dean of Men.

Dean Clark -- listen to this, and he came from an institution at that time of a little over 4,000 students -- "How can a Dean of Men Come into Closer Personal Contact with Students in a Large University?" (Laughter)

Dean Bradshaw of North Carolina spoke on personnel work and vocational guidance. Coulter of Purdue, "How Can Students be Stimulated to Greater and More Intelligent Interest in the Problems of the Day?" Dean Nicholson, "Relation of Fraternity, General and Professional, to the University." Dean Hubbard of the University of Texas talked about "Scholarship Requirements for Fraternities."

Dean Ripley of the University of Arkansas -- he will be remembered by many of the older men as really pretty much the clown of the organization in his day. As a matter of fact, with our one girl present, maybe I should not tell this tale. (Story)

Dean McClenahan of Princeton, talked about "Student Government -- its Character and Extent in Various Universities."

Finally, there was a representative of the Federated Council of Churches who attended this meeting as a special guest and talked to the men.

There is a certain familiarity about these topics they were talking about even in 1924.

In the remaining five minutes today, I would like to just rattle through some of the highlights of the history of the organization.

The first real milestone of the meetings, I think, was the 1926 meeting at Minnesota, which was a joint meeting

with educational personnel workers, and I think this was really the first meeting of national scope and import and high standards of program.

The name of the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men was first formally approved at the 11th Conference in 1919 here in Washington, D. C. That is the one that involved Dean Ripley. The name taken was the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men.

The first constitution was written in 1932 for the meeting at Los Angeles. It was written by Don Gardner of the University of Akron. At that time the policy of institutional memberships was established, and that was held for many, many years without any change.

With the formal adoption of the name which had been agreed upon in Washington, a purpose was set up: To correlate and study the most effective methods of service in the field of student welfare -- an objective that still stands with minor changes.

This name, NADAM, continued until 1951 when at the St. Louis meeting in 1951 it was changed to National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Really the reason for the change was simply the fact that so many Deans of Men became Deans of Students, that it did not quite meet the need.

There has been a very steady growth of the Association. Just to show you in a general way, in 1931 at Knoxville, Tennessee, there were 83 present; 1941, ten years later, at the Cincinnati meeting 100 were present; 1951 in St. Louis, 222 were present; 1960 at Columbus, 367; last year at Detroit it was well over 500, and O. D. tells us we are going to be around 800 at this meeting, so you can see there has been a great deal of growth.

Activities that have been added to the Association through the years: A Placement Service was started by Don Gardner when he was Secretary in 1935. This continues to date.

I think no organization has ever been more prone to get into self-examination than this one has, because we have had self-examinations of the Association, its members, critical examinations in 1925, 1928, 1932, 1939, 1940, 1944, and 1958. These are all in the record and can be checked out.

Very possibly the most valuable thing we own in the whole Association is represented by this book, which is last year's Proceedings. We have the complete Proceedings verbatim from about the 7th session, on. They are good minutes up through the first seven, and from there on we

have a verbatim record of the Association meetings, and these have become very valuable. Libraries seek earlier copies, and are willing to pay premiums for them. If you happen to find in your university library copies of some of these earlier ones, hang onto them, because they are valuable and scarce and hard to get. This published record is really a very valuable thing.

We have had associations with other disciplines beginning very early. The first was in 1923 with the Vocational Guidance group. In 1926 at Minnesota, it was the psychologists. In 1928 we began having some early relations with the Mental Health group. That has continued up to the fine relationship with Dr. Farnsworth at Harvard. We began our cooperation with housing with the American Institute of Architects in 1925. We helped found the Association of Foreign Students, and in 1926 had our first programs on foreign students.

We have cooperated with other associations of all kinds, along with the National Inter-Fraternity Conference, various federal agencies, the registrars, and national associations of various kinds. We have been a member of the American Council on Education since 1926, and we have had memberships in many state and regional meetings.

I suppose another milestone in the organization's history was the Harvard Seminars which took place in 1954, 1955, 1956 and 1957, when many of us had the opportunity to be trained in the seminars of College Administration which were conducted at the Harvard Graduate School of Business. I think my experience and the experience of several men in the room who attended this first 1954 seminar -- I see Jim nod his head, and there were several others there, and really that was a tremendous experience and one that I think has proved to the satisfaction of the Harvard Business School that such seminars are not only useful for Deans but very useful for Presidents, because they used us as guinea pigs in trying their case studies.

The thing that has been outstanding in the organization all through the years has been men. There have been great names in higher education through the years in this part of the country. I suppose right here in Washington, Henry Gratton Doyle is a name that means a great deal to many people. You are not very far from Princeton. Christian Gauss was a great name in education. You can almost take the list of magnificent men in previous years who have been either Dean of the College or Dean of Men, or Dean of Students, and you will find that they have a background within this Association.

We have always met in pleasant places. We have always had outstanding and timely speakers. We have always had up-to-the-minute programs. If you examine the program of this year, I think you will find it is a most outstanding and

up-to-the-minute program.

But I think the thing that characterizes the group more than anything else is the fact that you will leave here with a large number of new friends. They will be first-name friends. You will discover, as time goes on, you are doing the same thing that many of us have done through the years, namely, to do an awful lot of business over the long-distance telephone, because you will have a problem, and it will just occur to you to call somebody on the phone and say, "Here's my problem, how do you handle this thing?" I suppose there has been more business of this Association done man-to-man over long distance phone than any other Association of its kind that exists.

Dave, I have skipped a great many things, but I hope that gives the Green Ribbon members at least a faint idea of some of the background of the group, how it got started, how it has continued, and some of the things it has done through the years.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Fred, you gave the Green Ribbon wearers a lot of information. I am sure you gave some of us returning members information about the Association.

With our introductions and history of NASPA as a foundation, let us get on to the job of building some super structures for this Conference.

Many of you as young people in the profession are interested in our Placement Services. The fellow who coordinates our Placement Service is our director of the Placement Service, Richard Hulet, Dean of Students, Illinois State University. (Applause)

DEAN RICHARD HULET (Placement Service; Dean of Students, Illinois State University): Thank you. Dave, Father Vic, and I am going to say "Father" Fred (laughter) because in a very real sense Fred Turner is my professional father. I would be proud to have him as my real father, but I certainly am pleased to acknowledge the parenthood which exists, because he took me to raise as a young freshman in the Dean of Men's office at the University of Illinois a number of years ago, and I have worked for Fred for sixteen years. Fred Turner has more responsibility for where I am than anyone else in the world, and I hope that is not telling tales out of school, Fred. I don't think I have disgraced you too much, though perhaps on occasion. (Laughter)

This is a very fine group to welcome to this Association. We are very pleased to do so. Dave and Fred were not at all kidding when they told you how warm and friendly the feelings of the members of this Association will be during

the conference. It is not at all like the story which was told about the two Jesuits -- and you will notice, of course, during the course of the Conference that the Jesuits are the butt of a number of stories. They take this so graciously.

These two Jesuits had just graduated and finished that very long and arduous training in the educational program that they go through, which represents at least sixteen years beyond high school education, and these two, who were just about to enter their first charge, had not had an opportunity to work up into the hierarchy of the organization when they were killed in an automobile accident.

They went, of course, to Heaven and rapped on the Pearly Gates, to find that their status as Jesuits did not really help them a great deal, in that the keeper of the Pearly Gates held them out, saying he did not have any information as to whether or not they should come in.

They said, "Well, to whom should we appeal?" They had gotten this idea from their students, I am sure. (Laughter) He said, "Well, I will have to talk to the boss about this." They said, "It is very important for us to have an opportunity to work up in the hierarchy of this program here. We are Jesuits. We have had a great deal of training, and we feel we have the experience and would like the opportunity to work up in the chairs. We would like to present ourselves as available for this kind of rank advancement. We'll be willing to start at the bottom, but we do feel we really ought to have an opportunity to move up."

So Saint Peter asked them to wait a minute; he would get a message back from the boss, he said, which came very shortly, and it indicated in the message words to this effect: "Gentlemen: In Heaven we have no rank or station. Signed, "God, S.J." (Laughter)

I tell this story because I am embarrassed to read what stories I told last time. (Laughter) I do not recommend this [indicating the 1964 Proceedings] as reading.

I am here, Dave tells me, not to do this -- by the way, it is perfectly legitimate, since we have a verbatim transcript, to use the Proceedings to refresh your story larder, and many people have done this. If you go back far enough you will find this same story I just told in the Proceedings of many years ago.

My role here is to tell you a little bit about one of the services which NASPA offers to its members. This is the Placement Service. Fred mentioned that Don Gardner had operated this service. He was too modest to mention that for quite a number of years, in addition to being Secretary-Treasurer of this Association, Fred operated the Placement Service. After that, one of the grand old guys of the

Association, "Shorty" Nowotny of Texas, ran the Placement Service. And I am pleased to be at this point, therefore, the fifth Placement Service coordinator for the Association.

Our Service, as it was in the beginning and continues to be now, is an informal one. We list the available positions which are open, and we list the available people who are seeking employment, and we do very little beyond this. So the opportunity to utilize this Service is open to members on a pretty informal basis. You will find that the service which we perform is one simply of pointing a direction for you and giving you the opportunity, and you can take it from there. Whether you pursue this in the corridors outside of the meeting rooms at the Conference, or in the Gilded Cage (which is a very popular place to pursue this sort of activity), or at home through correspondence after you return to your universities, the Association's role here is a fairly informal one.

All members of the Association, whether you are voting delegates, institutional representatives, associate members, or student affiliates, are eligible for the service on a free basis. Individuals seeking employment may also avail themselves of the service on payment of a \$5.00 fee, even if they are not members.

During the Conference, we are located in the Woodley Room. This is in "F" corridor. The actual number is F-150. You will note on page 8 of your program the times that we are open. I hope you will pardon us if we slam the door in your face at the end of these times when we are to be open. We do this in deference to the program of the Association. We feel that the nature of the program, the speeches, the seminars that are offered, are such that we do not wish to interfere with the on-going nature of the program. So we will adhere to those times on the dates that are in your program. We hope you will cooperate with us in that respect.

At any rate, we welcome you to avail yourselves of the Service. If you have a job to list with us, do come by and list it. If you are interested in seeking employment yourself, come by also. We hope we can be of some service to you, and we hope we can continue in the tradition of friendly service for which NASPA is famous. Thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Dick.

President Vic has allowed me to spend a few minutes to introduce to you the two major subjects which will be discussed at this convention. I am sure the thoughts that you will carry away from Washington will be myriad. There are many important, creative topics to be presented, as you have already noted in your program. There are two, though, which

will probably highlight the convention.

Before I get started in this, let me note again that this afternoon is a one-hour session. We try to keep it informal. If there are questions you have about these two topics, by all means stand up and sound off. Probably I cannot answer the question, but there is someone here who can.

Parenthetically, also, it is a procedure we follow in our conventions, whenever you stand up from the floor, identify yourself by name and school, so that Ed can get the names in the minutes.

Also, before I get started on these two thoughts, let me continue with this introduction. There were several people who walked into the room after we had introduced ourselves. Will each one of those who has walked into the room these last few minutes, stand en masse. [They arose] All right, let's start with the first man. Give your name, your school and your responsibilities, and then if you sit down, this is another way that we could all identify at least names and some information.

... Each individual gave his name, position, and affiliation ...

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you, gentlemen.

You have heard, I hope -- I am sure you have -- about the Commission VIII study. Very briefly, this study that is in process now, probably was born in 1961 with the then existing Executive Committee. You will hear this presentation in detail tomorrow.

You will also hear that the study will not be completed until probably late this summer. But when it is completed, we will have, under the sponsorship of NASPA, I think one of the most significant, new, creative presentations yet to come out on the subject of student rights and social issues.

I would rather not belabor the background of the Commission VIII study, and thereby steal some of Dean Williamson and Mr. Cowan's presentation tomorrow. I would cordially invite you though -- and I know you are going to be busy, and I am sure you will sense (if you have not) that a hallmark of this convention is a lot of lobbying and hand-shaking and sharing of glasses of iced tea and other appropriate refreshment in the fellowship of the Association. Nevertheless, in your packet you will find a 44-page presentation to introduce or to act as a stimulus for the discussion tomorrow.

Those of us who have the privilege of being members

of Commission VIII have had to go through many, many pages -- I have not counted them, but I am sure I am not stretching it when I say that the pages already in print add up to perhaps four inches high. This must be close to 600 pages that the Commission, and mainly, I must add, Dean Williamson and Mr. Cowan have produced.

What you will find tomorrow will not be the complete essence of the report. I am sure John Cowan will caution all of us not to carry from Washington conclusions. Some of you, I have been told, were hoping you would be able to come to this convention and carry the conclusions back -- trends that are already identified -- to identify, indeed, the freedoms or lack of same that students have in matters of congregating on campus, speakers, freedom of the press, involvement in academic and administrative committees. There will be trends to which you will be introduced which probably will materialize in the final presentation.

I am very cautious on this subject and just take advantage of my opportunity of standing here this afternoon to admonish myself, as well as each of you, to realize that the conclusions which will be presented to you tomorrow will be tentative and not final.

Because there are several members of Commission VIII with us today, could I ask if there are any basic questions which any one of you has about the Commission VIII study, in anticipation of what you will read, I hope, in the next few hours, and what you will hear tomorrow? I tend to emphasize, I grant, my bias as to the importance of this study to the field of education.

DEAN AYLMEY RYAN (Student Affairs Division, University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada): I am not doing this to be virtuous. I did read the report while the maid was making the room.

I wonder if the Commission will say something specific about the difference between a student as a registered student in a university and as a citizen of a country at the same time. I wondered if those rights are always overlapping and identical, or whether sometimes they should be shunted into their rights as a citizen and away from the university.

Perhaps I have not put the question right, but I am interested in that.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I think I understand your question. May I defer my responding to it to anybody else who might like to respond to it. Father Vic.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I do not think that question will be answered directly, Dean, but I do think that the

contiguity, if I may say, the inter-relationship of the two aspects of the student's life will be clarified in larger issues, such as the student and the law, and how far the law goes into the campus, and the difference between -- I think you will get it indirectly rather than directly. That is what I am saying. There will be various things to give indications of this, but I do not think the question will be attacked directly.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Any other questions?

The other subject to be discussed this afternoon will not be given as much time on the program as it deserves. It behooves me, therefore, to give it some attention, particularly to those of you who are new to the Association.

As Dean Turner noted, we have come from a very small group, some 48 years ago now -- isn't that about right? Forty-seven years ago -- to an increasingly large organization. If it is true our membership in the organization will have increased 300 this year over last year, each of us has to predict what the future growth will be.

The Executive Committee has spent many hours -- I cannot begin to equate the many hundreds of man-hours -- materializing what we call the restructuring of NASPA. NASPA has had traditionally, or in recent years, a President, two Vice Presidents, a Secretary-Treasurer, a President Designate, two Vice Presidents Designate, along with our officers, the Placement Director, the Conference Chairman, the Editor, and the Historian.

I remember just a very few years ago sitting in your chairs -- I will not get too nostalgic here, but I hope to make a point -- looking at fellows on the various platforms during conventions, and saying, "Golly Neds, how did anybody ever get up there? These men have been in their profession many, many years." I do not know that I ever verbalized the term, the guard, the inside group, the in-group, but I am sure I remember with some vivid thought sitting as a new member in this convention and saying, "Well, how on earth can I have my voice heard?" And I was told bluntly. I thought I had a voice that was deserving of being heard -- very foolish of me, but I still entertained that thought.

We are now on the threshold, subject to the vote and the approval of this convention, of very drastically restructuring the Association. The details of this will be elaborated upon in a future meeting, but as a preview of coming attractions, let me state that we are thinking of having regional representation.

In a nutshell, if this proposal is approved, we will have a President, of course, a President Designate. The Commissions and Committees as we know them now will be

abolished. The important phrase there is "as we know them now." In place of that, there will be four Commissions, each headed by a Director. These Commissions will have, we propose, five members. All of the work of the Association will relate to each of these four Commissions.

I will not give you full titles, but there will be one on research, one on Association matters, one on professional relationships and interrelationships, and the fourth one -- I better just give you the full names: Professional Relations and Legislation, Professional Development Standards, Research and Publications, Association Personnel and Services.

Of the various changes that are being proposed, perhaps the most significant is this: It will be proposed to the voting delegates that the United States and Canada be divided according to the regional accrediting areas. It is hoped that we will have a vice president elected from each of the six already established accreditation regions, with one exception. Because the North Central Association of Schools is such a large area and contains so many schools, it behooves the Association to have two vice presidents from that group.

This will enable you at your desk to elect a person from your region, and your region alone, who will be a voting participating member of the Executive Committee. He will be your voice in court. He will be the one to whom you will turn if you have some gripes. You would indeed then have a voice in the Association.

In addition, there will be four members of the Executive Committee appointed by the President.

I do not want to go too fast, or too slowly, but because of the significance of this, and I think in part because we spent so much time on it, I would hope that whether or not you are the voting representative of your school, you would ask any questions you have.

I will have to admit there are times when sitting in these sessions I have thought of this Pan American jet pilot who was flying his plane over the Atlantic, and announced to his passengers, "I think you have a right to know, folks, that we just lost our electrical system. We do not have any radio, radar, or homing devices." Feeling that he had to cheer them up a bit, he said, "But we have an excellent airplane, a good crew, and a good load of fuel, and we are up here in the jet stream and we are making tremendous time, even though we don't know where in the hell we are going." (Laughter)

I think your Association knows where it is going. It will go there because you will be informed of its direction.

May I stop at this point and ask if there are questions about this restructuring plan?

DEAN JOHN W. DUBOCQ (Dean of Students, George Williams College, Chicago, Illinois): I wondered if the restructuring implies a move toward regional meetings in addition to a national meeting of NASPA?

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: As one person who has participated in these discussions, my answer would be no. I have not sensed that as an implied secondary goal of this restructuring at all. We do know that some of you meet in regions. We do in the south. We have a Southern Association. There are some of you who have state associations, Pennsylvania, and Ohio -- many of them have. The Allerton Conference. No, there is no thought of dividing NASPA into seven instead of three parts, like Gaul.

This is merely to enable you, as one person, to have a very active part in electing to the Executive Committee your man. The Executive Committee in any organization this size is charged with many responsibilities. There are times when I as one person wondered if we, as a relatively small group -- and this, I might say parenthetically, this proposed group is 19 members in size, and has quite a responsibility. We meet, we communicate with each other during our year in office. But we represent many, many people. To be sure that we are representing you, we hope that this restructuring will be a contributory step.

DEAN DUBOCQ: May I comment? Father Vic, I am sure, would understand that there is good scriptural support for dividing NASPA into seven parts. I think it would be well for the health and welfare of the organization to stimulate meetings where they are not in each one of these seven areas.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Fred wants to talk to you on this point.

DEAN TURNER: Dave, I would like to make a brief comment on this, again from the historical point of view.

As late as 1934 when we met at Evanston (Northwestern University), Harold Lobdell, at that time being with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and with a membership of 61, came forth with a proposition that we are getting too big, that we would be wise to set a limit of 100 institutional members, and when we reached 100 we would quit. And from there on we admit by selection, we take applications; if any vacancies occur, we will then admit another member.

What was Harold Lobdell thinking about? Mind you, this organization started very small. A group of men who were close personal friends, all scholars from well-identified disciplines, who had been placed in administrative work,

sometimes against their own will, because it had to be done, there was work to be done. And these were men who were very dedicated to the type of work that they were doing -- I do not like that word "dedicated" but I think you know what I mean.

As it began to get up toward 100 in size, there was great concern over the fact that if we get much bigger than this, we are going to lose something that is very precious to us, which is a close personal friendship that came through the Association. I suppose that those of us who have been in the organization through the years, a good many years, would say without question that the best friends we have in the world are friends out of this group.

Now, how can we keep that and at the same time meet this tremendous need to share with other people the thing that has meant so much to us? I do not know that the Executive Committee -- and I am pretty much of a back seat member in that, because I am a past president, and I am not at all sure that this proposed plan is the best plan. But it is a plan that the committee has slaved over for hours, and they have tried to come up with the best thing they can. If this does not work, it is set so that it can be amended afterwards. I would urge you to give close attention to it, to give it your thought and your prayers, because we may need some of those, too, because here is an attempt to establish an administration of this Association so that we may have an administration keyed to the times, and at the same time try as best we can to keep this feeling of friendship and smallness and intimacy -- regard for each other -- that has meant so much to us throughout the years.

You may not like it at all, but if you do not like it, bear in mind that a lot of men have thought very hard on this thing and have come up with what they believe is at this time the best solution for us, to try to go ahead and at least get a start toward the type of administration that will meet the need.

Our present administrative setup is a horse-and-buggy setup in the jet age, and we have simply got to grow up and get an organization, a business administration that will take care of the needs of today.

If you just have that in mind, that here are the two big questions, how can we keep this organization the friendly, fine organization it has been, and still at the same time share it with all the people we would like to share it with, that is our hope. Thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Are there any more questions on the introduction to this restructuring? Please remember this is only a proposal. As Fred said, we do know that if this does not meet the needs felt by the voting members, we will

continue with our main structure, and you will apply to the Executive Committee the theme of the story, mentioning St. Peter, the story about a modern St. Peter to whom a fellow went, knocked on the Pearly Gate, and St. Peter greeted him. The man gave him his name. Since this is a modern day St. Peter, he went to his IBM card file and checked through there to see if he could find a card for this man, and he couldn't. St. Peter in this story isn't really very smart. He didn't know what to do because his machine and card system had never failed him before.

He went back to this man and said, "I don't know how you got this far, but I don't find your card. What have you done to deserve coming through these gates?"

The fellow thought a long time and tried to think of something he had done that was constructive and good. After much meditation, he said, "Well, I guess about the only thing I can remember that I have done really good is one time I gave \$15.00 to the church."

Well, this again threw St. Peter. He noticed St. Paul sitting over in the corner reading a book. He thought he better seek some counsel. He went over to St. Paul and told him the story, and asked, "What do you think I ought to do?"

Without lifting his head from the book, St. Paul said, "I would give him his \$15.00 back and tell him to go to hell." (Laughter)

Question?

DEAN KENNETH R. VENDERBUSH (Dean of Men, Lawrence College): As a member of the Executive Committee, I was listening from the point of view of the Green Ribbon men, and I wondered if something should not be said about the task of orientation that the Executive Committee sees, and the place of the working members of the Association in taking part of the work of the Association by being on sort of task forces that will be directed by these directors and these commissions.

As it has been presented, it seemed a little too neat at the top without any involvement from the Association other than voting for the regional Vice Presidents. And I think maybe you ought to say a little bit about that, because what we really wanted was to get more people working in the Association more efficiently.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thanks. I am glad you caught that. In this introduction, I hope I conveyed to you that this restructuring was planned for involvement of the members in an organization which is increasing in size. The four directors, these four responsibilities which each one

will have, will be manned by many, many people, instead of having on-going Commissions, some of which traditionally have worked most productively; others (we must be honest in noting) have not worked very productively.

If you as a Dean have a problem and you think there is a subject here which needs study, attention and advice, all you have to do is make your voice heard. This will be considered by a small group. It will not be carried to the big brass on the Executive Committee. These directors are responsible for their areas. A task force can be selected, as we propose, with very little time lapse, to study this job.

In other words, we will have, we presume, many ad hoc committees, task forces, assigned to do a job, to get an answer for you as a Dean. This could be something in your area. It could be related nationally or regionally. There is no limit to what subjects could be attended to by these various task forces, in order to have a relationship and coordination. This is just why we are proposing these four directors. One director might have seven, or eight, or nine task forces working at one time, reporting to the convention, either through the journal or at the Convention or through a special mailing, but to get the word of the development, the dynamics of our profession, out to you.

Is this one way of putting it to reinforce your position, Kenny? This is how I look at it. Other members of the Executive Committee could verbalize something similar to this, I am sure, to convey this point.

Mark, do you have any thoughts on this restructuring? You have been a backbone in its development. Mark Smith of Denison.

DEAN MARK SMITH (Dean of Men, Denison University): I think, David, there is one other thing. I do not think that with a task orientation we will have the old complaint that you cannot get your voice heard. Not only if you have a problem, but if you want to do some work, you now have a person you can contact to offer your services. I think this is one thing that we expect to happen, and that people are going to start volunteering. It does not matter whether you have been in NASPA one year or ten years. It matters probably if you have been in one year; you are more likely to volunteer. (Laughter) But this too is expected to happen, for people to offer their services to be members of ad hoc working task orientation groups.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Thank you.

It is virtually at the stroke of three o'clock. The one hour is about done. I hope we have conveyed our thoughts in an aura of quietness, soft-sell type of presentation.

No one is trying to convince you of anything. The objectives, I hope, are met, that of having you introduced to each other, get a little better understanding of who else the Green Ribboners are, and a little preview of the coming attractions, the subjects which you will be asked to give some real serious thought to before the convention concludes Tuesday night.

Are there any announcements? I do not see O.D. here. Can you think of any?

At four o'clock the buses leave for Howard University and the banquet and the First General Session tonight.

The meeting stands adjourned. (Applause)

... The Green Ribbon Meeting adjourned at three o'clock ...

DINNER MEETING
Sunday - April 4, 1965

The Dinner Meeting held in Baldwin Hall, Howard University, convened at six-thirty o'clock, President Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., NASPA President, presiding.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Ladies and Gentlemen: The NASPA Conference for 1965 will begin with an invocation from Dr. William Stuart Nelson, Vice President for Special Projects here at Howard University. Dr. Nelson.

DR. WILLIAM STUART NELSON (Vice President, Howard University; Invocation): Let us unite in prayer.

We thank Thee, our Father, for the occasion which draws us together at this hour. We thank Thee for those men and women who, through all time, have dedicated themselves to the sharing of their lives with their fellow men and with Thee so that their society might become the spiritually rich and happy society which Thou hast ordained.

We express very special gratitude tonight for those who are sharing their lives devotedly with the youth of our times. We know that this is no easy role, that it draws upon one's every resource -- physical, intellectual, spiritual. We well know that few, if any, roles are nobler.

Vouchsafe, we pray, to our friends gathered here the wisdom, the patience, and the love that will sustain them.

We know that no time has ever been like the time

before it. Help us then to gird ourselves for tomorrow's new problems and for tomorrow. Let it be written a hundred years from now, our Father, yea, a thousand, that the elders of this generation were equal to its problems.

Now we thank Thee for this food and for the fellowship of this hour. Amen.

... After dinner was served, the guests at the head table were introduced ...

DR. ARMOUR J. BLACKBURN (Chairman, Host Committee; Howard University): Father Vic, Distinguished Guests, Wives and Members of NASPA: O. D. told me rather emphatically that there was to be no speech making tonight. President Nabrit is going to give you the official welcome.

I do want to let you in on a little secret. About two months ago I told President Nabrit that he would more than likely get an invitation to deliver the welcome address. He readily consented to do so, and then he looked at his calendar and said, "I'm sorry; I can't make it. I am supposed to deliver a series of lectures at the University of California at Berkeley, beginning with the 4th and ending on the 9th."

So I communicated this to O.D., whereupon he said, "Well, Armour, you are going to have to pinch-hit." So I proceeded to write a welcome address. (Laughter)

Then about two weeks ago I went to the President's office for a conference and I asked him casually, would he be able to make any address, and he said, "Yes, I am going to make the welcome address." (Laughter) So this is a case where communications came near breaking down. (Laughter)

I regret that you will not be able to hear my masterpiece, (laughter) but I am delighted that President Nabrit was able to change his plans and to be present tonight and extend the official welcome.

We have some other distinguished members of the University community that I would like you to meet at this time.

Our Secretary of the University, Mr. G. Frederick Stanton. (Applause)

The Dean of the Graduate School and director of the University Self Study Program, and his wife, Dr. and Mrs. Charles H. Thompson. (Applause)

The Chief Business Officer and Treasurer of the University, and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. James B. Clarke. (Applause)

The Executive Assistant to the President, and his

wife, Mr. and Mrs. G. L. Washington. (Applause)

The Acting Dean of the Graduate School, Dean Carroll L. Miller. (Applause)

The Dean of the School of Dentistry, and his wife, Dean and Mrs. Russell A. Dixon. (Applause)

The Dean of the School of Social Work, and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Arnett G. Lindsay. (Applause)

The Dean of the School of Religion, Dr. Samuel Gandy. (Applause)

The Associate Dean of Students for Women, Dean Edna Calhoun. (Applause)

Dr. Hurley Doddy, Professor of Education. (Applause)

Mrs. Goldie Claiborne, a director of our National Aid Office. (Applause)

Mrs. Catherine Green, Counselor for Foreign Students. (Applause)

Miss Marsha Van Cleve, Assistant Director of the office of Foreign Students. (Applause)

Miss Martha Carter, Administrative Secretary to the Dean of Students. (Applause)

Mrs. Norma Lyons, Director of the Student Employment Office. (Applause)

Is Mrs. Butcher here?

About two years ago we invited the deans from all of the institutions of higher education in metropolitan Washington to Howard for a lunch, and we told them that this Anniversary Conference would be held during this time, and asked them if they would serve as co-host. I am happy to say that they responded unanimously, and for this period we have been meeting regularly, and they have been working zealously to make this Conference a success. I want you to meet them and they are due much credit if the Conference is a success, and they share the blame if it is not. (Laughter)

Dr. Bernard Hodinko, Dean from the University of Maryland. Dean Francis J. LeMire, Towson State Teachers College. They are providing hospitality. (Applause)

The Committee on Exhibits, you have met Dean James McPadden. Would you stand again, please? Dean Eugene C. Orth from Catholic University.

The Hospitality for Wives was assumed by two charm-

ing ladies from American University, Dean Susan Olson and Mrs. Sue Shaw. I do not believe they are here.

Registratoon for Wives, Dean Charles Van Way and Dean Joseph W. Neale. Dean and Mrs. Van Way, Dean of Students at American University. (Applause)

The Banquet Entertainment, Dean Paul Bissell, George Washington University. (Applause)

The Registration Committee -- and this responsibility has been assumed by representatives from Georgetown University: Father L. P. Hurley, who served as Chairman. Many of you met Father Devine who is not here tonight, but extends his regrets. Dean William Wright, Dean Donald R. Buckner, Father Edward A. Geary. (Applause)

General Arrangements -- this responsibility was assumed by Gallaudet College: Dean Elizabeth Benson, Dean Richard M. Phillips, and Dean Thomas Clayton. None of them could get here.

Public Relations has been shared by Dean Daniel E. Powers of Georgetown University and Mr. Ernest Goodman of Howard University.

Then we have another young man on the committee who was responsible for -- we call him a Liaison Officer, and in this connection liaison means that he had the major responsibility for the work. (Laughter) Dean Carl E. Anderson of Howard University. (Applause)

Mr. Charles H. Bush is Chairman of the Committee for looking out after distinguished guests and speakers. Dean and Mrs. Bush. (Applause)

I forgot to introduce the charming wife of Dean Anderson, Mrs. Carl Anderson. (Applause)

The person responsible for the dinner is Mr. Benny J. Pugh, Director of Student Activities at Howard University.

Mr. Walter Hawkins was responsible for the reception. He is Associate Director of the Foreign Students Advisory Service. Mr. Hawkins and Mrs. Hawkins. I believe that concludes our list.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: We hope you have all enjoyed the dinner, and that you will make post haste to rush right back to Cramton Auditorium.

... The Dinner meeting adjourned at seven fifty-five o'clock ...

FIRST GENERAL SESSION
Sunday - April 4, 1965

The First General Session convened in Cramton Auditorium, Howard University, at eight-twenty o'clock, President Designate Glen Nygreen, Dean of Students, Hunter College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Ladies and Gentlemen: For the formal opening of the First General Session of the 47th Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, may I introduce a long-time member of this Association, the distinguished Dean of Men of Louisiana State University, Arden O. French, and ask you to rise while he delivers the invocation to open these sessions.

DEAN ARDEN O. FRENCH (Dean of Men, Louisiana State University; Invocation): Our Father which art in heaven, we invoke Thy divine blessings on this, the 47th convention of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs. We thank you for the long and distinguished service of this Association of personnel leaders to the students of this nation.

For those who have gone before us and reaped their rewards for service, we ask Your blessings. For those of us still in the field of greater challenge, we seek Your eternal guidance. Help us in our deliberations to elevate the truths of life and rekindle the flame of human values in a world that encourages impersonal and materialistic values as ends in themselves.

Dedicate this convention of educational leaders to the proposition that spiritual values must be transmitted to students along with intellectual achievement. Our prayer, therefore, for this convention is: Let the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Amen.

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Thank you, Dean French.

One of the finest kinds of in-service training for student personnel administrators is the opportunity to visit on the campuses of our co-workers, to see the problems with which they have to deal, and the adjustments they make to their own conditions.

I have had the privilege of being on Dean French's campus and talking with him, and I am sure that each and every one of us who has the opportunity to visit at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, will come away in admiration for the courage and forward looking vision of Dean French and his colleagues in that administration.

Some years ago NASPA faced with regret the neces-

sity of no longer holding its annual Conferences on college campuses. Our attendance and membership had grown to the point where this was not possible. So we began the routine of meeting in large urban settings with adequate hotel facilities.

Unexpectedly we are now in a time when urban colleges and universities are the mode and so, surprisingly, we find ourselves on more college campuses than we ever were and gaining from this kind of direct observation also.

We are here on the campus of Howard University tonight as the guests of the faculty, student body, and staff, led by a distinguished American educator, President James M. Nabrit.

In 1961, at the NASPA Conference in Colorado Springs we planned a program around the question of the civil liberties of students. Looking for a man who could bring to us some important trends of the times to come, we found the ablest person we could to be this man James Nabrit, former Dean of the Law School at Howard University, a distinguished American lawyer with a record of achievement in practice before the Supreme Court of the United States in cases which have become landmarks of American jurisprudence.

But the most distinguished aspect of his career has been his thoughtful leadership of this great academic community, which I might also identify as one of our great national resources which belongs to everyone of us.

It is with pride and pleasure that I present to you the President of this great institution, an old friend and participant in NASPA Conferences, Dr. James M. Nabrit, President, Howard University. (Prolonged applause)

DR. JAMES M. NABRIT, JR. (President, Howard University): Master of Ceremonies, Dean Nygreen, Dr. French, President Yanitelli, and Members of NASPA: We welcome you to Howard University. We are a member and an active participant in the affairs of this illustrious national organization of personnel workers with students in universities and colleges.

As the Master of Ceremonies indicated to you, I had the opportunity of visiting with you in 1961. I do not know what it is about NASPA, whether it is the nature of your work, or whether it is that you live in a world of excitement and of new problems and occasions, but my relationships have always come in very unusual circumstances.

When I went out to Colorado Springs I flew in April, just about this time, to Denver. We left on a beautiful day in Washington. When we got to Denver there was a terrible snow storm, if you recall, and we barely made it into the airport. Then we took a bus from Denver to Colorado Springs,

and on the way we saw another bus over in the ditch at the side of the road. When we reached the Broadmoor, they told us very cheerfully that the bus had had an accident and had killed seven people. That was my introduction to NASPA. (Laughter)

Now you come to Howard to visit us, and I am supposed to be in California. I was supposed to have left this morning, but Dr. Blackburn, who is our Dean of Students, did not exactly twist my arm; he just insisted that I stay and greet you. So I have done that with great pleasure, but I have to leave before you can really get started. So I do not want you to consider that your relationships with Howard University bear any relationship to these events.

It may be just something like the young man who was in Selma during the recent disturbances, and he said he was watching an elderly colored man leaning against a bank window. And the mobs were surging and the police were beating and snatching people -- you saw it on television. This man kept leaning against the bank window. One of the police ran up and grabbed him. They said, "Come on!" He said, "For what?" They said, "You're rioting. Everybody's rioting." He said, "I'm not. I'm just leaning against a window watching."

The policeman said, "That's impossible. Why aren't you rioting?"

He said, "Well, I'll tell you, I have relatives on both sides." (Laughter and applause)

So I want you to know that we have some interests on both sides.

When I talked to you out at Colorado Springs, you were busy considering this question of academic freedom and of the students' relationship to the university, and how we might best deal with this question of how we might prepare the universities for dealing with it, and in some degree, at that time at least, this was an academic question. It was something that the intellectual members of this Association could use as a means of testing out all of the theories and thoughts which they had.

Now when you assemble in 1965, four years later, it is no longer academic. It may be life and death to the academic institutions, but it is not an academic matter. This is because the things which you discussed there have already occurred, and in many instances, in spite of your advice, in spite of the studies which you have made and published, in spite of the discussions which you have invoked and provoked in institutions all over the country, we still are not prepared in our educational institutions for the kind of thrust that our students are facing us with.

So as you meet in the nation's capital, and as we welcome you to the university, we hope that your deliberations will shed still more light on this question of relationship of the students to the university and the university's relationship to the students, and some light on the very necessary premise that students must not become numbers and ciphers, digits, but must remain individuals and human beings and must be dealt with on that basis.

This is not always easy, because in the atmosphere in which we live, it is sometimes the thing to do to act without regard to reason, to act either on the basis of emotion, real or imagined, and therefore the kind of responses which we have prepared and the kind of speeches which we have at hand to deliver to people who are receptive and in a rational mood, do not fit the kind of situations with which we are confronted.

If you look in the history of the universities in South America particularly, and the Far Eastern countries and in the Mediterranean, you will find, as you know, that the students form an integral, active part of the political parties and of the revolutionary forces that have brought about an overthrow of colonialism in those countries, and therefore the student leader in an institution is, by virtue of that fact alone, a political leader in his country.

Now, without tracing that, it is sufficient to say that that is not the history of the development of our educational institutions. On the contrary, we have thought of them as places of quiet, places of retreat, places where, removed from the clamor and excitement and disturbances of the world of action, we might commune, we might study, we might do research, and we might engage in dialog. Thus we have had the term "Ivory Tower" coined and applied to our institutions of higher education.

But in the last ten or fifteen years particularly, we have had incursions made against this place of solitude, this place of quiet and study, and we have found political and social action programs and participants intruding upon the academic life. It is this new activity, it is this new penetration of the ideal institutions, which gives us the present sense of stress, of strain, and the undoubted disturbance in higher education in our country.

When we welcome you, we welcome you in the sense that it is to you largely that these educational institutions must look for guidance in these troubled times.

We know the limits of the problem. We must have law and order. We must have an orderly place in which we may engage in study and research. On the other hand, we know that there is a basic right to freedom of speech, petition, for redress of grievance. Therefore somewhere within these

boundaries there must be worked out an accommodation within the university community, with faculty and with students. This is an important, basic problem with which NASPA must come to grips.

I noted in this morning's paper an account of a study by Dean Williamson and another member of the Association, in which they were giving the percentages of institutions which permitted certain people to speak and did not permit others, and the different types of speakers to whom these various vicinities applied. They ranged all the way from institutions that permitted generally a person to speak who was invited by the students, down to some of the religious institutions, of which institutions only five percent permitted anything but the orthodox speakers to speak.

So the range of this problem and the gravity of it has some relationship to the nature of the institution, whether it is public or private, whether it is sectarian or whatever other organized form supports the institution.

I have said these are not easy problems. I have merely tried to remind you that we look to you for solutions. I do not say this as a bystander, because all of the things that you can think about in some degree we have here, as most urban institutions would have. In some instances we have them compounded and also confounded. (Laughter)

We welcome you, then, in this spirit of inquiry, in this spirit of confidence and trust and eager anticipation with which we wait upon your deliberations so that we may know how to deal with this problem. I can assure you that on Monday when I come back I will send for Dr. Blackburn to get the answer. (Laughter)

Therefore I wish you all of the success possible in your meeting, and I am hopeful that you will come back to Howard University, or that I might have an opportunity to be with you at some future date. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Thank you, President Nabrit. May you have not only good flying to Los Angeles, California but may you provide some solutions for the people you may be teaching on the faculty at UCLA. (Laughter)

One of the great privileges of being on a college campus is an opportunity to share in some of the student activity of a high quality of that campus. Tonight we are privileged to hear the distinguished choir of Howard University, directed this evening by Mrs. Evelyn White; Mr. Clyde Parker accompanist.

... Entertainment by the Howard University Choir, directed by Mrs. Evelyn White ...

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: The Choir will present their numbers in three groups. The next group of three numbers represents that distinctive American art form, the spiritual. The final number will be "Song of the Open Road," with the solo trumpet played by Langston Fitzgerald and featuring Clyde Parker as accompanist.

... Prolonged applause at the conclusion of the presentation by the Howard University Choir ...

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: There have been many distinguished moments in the history of NASPA Conferences, and this privilege to hear the Howard University Concert Choir is certainly one we shall all long remember.

To those of us who serve the Association, there is no applause due, yet it is appropriate that at our first General Session, for those of you who have not identified some of the men who have served this Association during the year since last we met, that they be identified. I want now to take time to do this, and to shorten that time let me suggest that these people rise in their places as I identify them, and remain standing until all have been called upon.

... Introduction of the Officers of the Association and the members of the Executive Committee ...

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: There have been many men qualified to leadership of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs during its forty-seven years of history. We have been privileged -- and I use that word in its very real sense -- privileged to have as our President this past year the Director of Student Personnel of Saint Peter's College, Jersey City, New Jersey.

How does one introduce a friend who wears many hats -- priest and counselor, teacher, friend, leader -- Father Victor R. Yanitelli is all of these things.

It has been my privilege these past two years to have known him in his native haunts, the Bronx of New York, where those men and women who are leaders in that area and who have known him since boyhood call him "Chick."

Father Yanitelli has infinite patience, great understanding, boundless love and confidence in the ability of men of good will to come to agreement and common understanding, and sometimes if you were privileged to sit in our Executive Committee meetings, you would recognize that he is the only one who has that boundless patience and confidence. (Laughter) But he comes through for all of us, and we are grateful tonight, in these words of introduction to acknowledge our debt, but most of all our friendship for Father Vic. I present to you our President. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI (President's Address): Thank you very much, Glen. That was very moving. I might just break down and cry, except for the fact that I do want to welcome you ladies and gentlemen to the Anti-Climax Club. (Laughter)

After everything beautiful that Glen has said about me, it is going to be a shame to stand up here and destroy it. After the eloquent address you got from Dr. Nabrit, it is going to be a shame to stand up here and say what he said, in much worse language; and after that beautiful choir, I cannot even sing you a song. So I ask your patience while I give my reason for being here.

Basically and most importantly, I am here because your hardworking Conference Chairman O. D. Roberts simply told me there was no other place for me on the program, and since we had to have a presidential address, he wanted to put me here. There was a reason for that, and a valid one, and that was that we want more time in the business session in order to discuss NASPA restructuring. Now this is crucial business, and it cannot be hurried because we want your intelligent judgment, and we do not want to make the judgment until you have all your questions answered.

The second cause for my being here at this time is that the President must say goodbye, and try to give a "state of the Union" chat, together with an apologia, or an explanation of what that old Executive Committee has been up to for the past year.

I could bore you with a long list of the items we dealt with, meeting by meeting, the hundreds of man hours we put in on many things that are important to you, and sometimes the man hours we wasted killing ourselves.

Frankly, I think that the proposals on the restructuring of NASPA and the secretariat, or the administrative assistant -- they do not necessarily come in one package -- are index enough of the state of our union. There is a ferment taking place in NASPA, which to me means life. And if the psychophysiological definition of life is the capacity for immanent, i.e., self-initiated, action, then NASPA is very much alive. We are moving and, I am happy to say, we are moving in a professional direction.

In fact, I do not think it would be over-optimistic to say that we have turned a crucial corner. More professional and technical content has been brought into the NASPA program. More and more, the wider scene in higher education has become the backdrop for our Association's involvement and for our daily efforts. New lines of national leadership are being opened up to us by the work of Commission VIII about which you will hear more tomorrow. Under the intelligent and competent guidance of Ed Williamson and his associate, John

Cowan -- and I bow to you both -- Commission VIII has thrust NASPA forcefully into areas which have heretofore been the special province of NSA and AAUP. And we come into these areas, not as competitors, but as professional partners, all seeking the same higher educational goals that transcend the confining limits of one or other organizations.

Speaking of transcending one organization's limits, most of you know that NASPA is participating in the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA). Membership in COSPA gives us the opportunity to be a part of what Dr. W. H. Cowley of Stanford has agreed is "the most auspicious development in the student affairs field that has occurred during the past 30 years." [W. H. Cowley, "Reflections of a Troublesome but Hopeful Rip Van Winkle," in The Journal of College Student Personnel, VI (1964), 66-73, p.67.]

COSPA is the instrumentality for a broad frontal approach to professional problems which affect all our associations and which no one group can adequately handle on its own. Our commitment to COSPA must be professional. It must be total. For it represents a great opportunity to pull ourselves up by our professional bootstraps.

Ladies and gentlemen, we stand on the threshold of a new professional greatness. NASPA has arrived at what the late President Kennedy referred to in another context as the "New Frontier." Or, if you prefer the more immediate, we are having thrust upon us an unusual opportunity to contribute our share to making a reality of President Johnson's vision of the "Great Society." Parenthetically but significantly, it should be noted for the record that we stand here by virtue of the work and the very lives of those who have gone before us in NASPA. The "New Frontier" and the "Great Society" may produce a new NASPA, but it will always be a NASPA permeated with the surviving wisdom of our predecessors, a NASPA consciously grateful that it has been given to us to reap where others have sown.

Leibniz said it in somewhat obstetrical terms: "le present est gros de l'avenir" -- "The present is pregnant with the future." Abraham Lincoln gave the idea his own unique touch of homely wisdom when he said simply: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then judge better what to do and how to do it." My point is that our response to the challenge of tomorrow will be meaningful and effective only in proportion to the responsibility we bring to bear upon the present task. And for NASPA, we can have no greater present task than to nail down the knowledge of where we are and whither we are tending. If we are going to judge better what to do and how to do it, it would be well for us to pause periodically and take stock -- especially in the rapidly moving educational world of our day. This is what a Conference is for, to take stock and to gain new inspiration.

The knowledge explosion has been and is so rapid that our generation finds itself bewildered. A. C. Monteith, an official of the Westinghouse Corporation, has pointed out that half the knowledge of the graduate engineer of ten years ago is already obsolete and that half the knowledge he will need a decade from now is not even on the boards. Neil W. Chamberlain, the Yale professor of economics, has shown how this rapid growth of knowledge has produced an inverse ratio of increasing obsolescence. Even in the skilled manual trades, the tool-and-die worker completing his apprenticeship begins early in his career to lose his competence to deal with new and developing technologies. [Neil W. Chamberlain, "Retooling the Mind" in The Atlantic, September, 1964, pp. 48-50.]

Automation has created unemployment problems and the need for more and more programs of re-training. But these are only surface symptoms. Underneath them, deep in the very substance of our society, strains and dislocations are taking place whereby the unskilled and uneducated are increasingly in danger of being ostracized. Soon there may be no place in our society for the unskilled or uneducated citizen to live a fruitful life. When that day arrives, I think the long debate over higher education being a privilege or a right will be settled -- in favor of the latter.

If there is one characteristic that marks our generation, it is the presence of what they call "exponential" change -- a movement so rapid and so radical that it affects every area of existence in our social, scientific, economic, political, cultural, and moral life. Everything seems to be subject to the half-humorous, half-cynical remark sometimes made about our weapons systems: "If it works, it's obsolete."

All of you are familiar with the old cliché that "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." Well, here goes. I'm going to prove I'm no angel. It is my conviction that this increased tempo has been of benefit to the student personnel profession.

No one wonders any longer whether student personnel has a rightful place on the American educational scene. Today voices are rarely raised to challenge student personnel's presence in the groves of academe. Sheer historical necessity has forced student personnel to a place of prominence among the many complex factors that make up American higher education. The profession is growing and again by sheer historical necessity, will continue to grow far into the foreseeable future. Programs will perforce expand, and are expanding, new techniques will be devised. And yet, no matter how many or how great the changes that are to come, no matter what the forces of historical inevitability or historical necessity may impose upon us -- here let me stick my neck far out -- the purpose and principles for which and on which student personnel work is founded will not change in any fundamental fashion.

If the student personnel professional is to continue to have meaning in our world, he will always have to function as an educator. He will always have to act as the integrating factor among faculty, students and administration. Above all, he will have to devote himself passionately to the individual student, as an individual.

The reverse -- depersonalization -- did not begin at Berkeley. Its creeping cancerous encroachment upon modern society has been the focus of the existentialist attack long before World War II and Jean Paul Sartre. Man depersonalized becomes an anomaly. In the midst of a bureaucratized, impersonal, mass society, he becomes overwhelmed by a sense of homelessness, of alienation. As William Barrett has said in his book Irrational Man: "(Man) becomes trebly alienated: a stranger to God, to nature, and to the gigantic social apparatus that supplies his material wants. But the worst and final form of alienation, toward which indeed the others tend is man's alienation from his own self." [William H. Barrett, Irrational Man, Doubleday, 1962, p. 36.]

It is against this process of alienation and depersonalization that we must fight with all the resources at our command. To state it more positively, as student personnel workers, we must commit ourselves -- permit me a religious rather than an editorial license -- I would say we must consecrate ourselves to the preservation of the human person, human values. We must do this in the thousand daily tasks, the trivia of detail that cross our desks, on week-ends and even at night. We must do this also with thought for the larger implications, with a philosophy examined by research.

It is perhaps in these areas that we have the longest way to go. It is here perhaps that we have allowed ourselves to fall farthest behind. Are we so deeply involved in what Dr. Cowley usefully calls the "practicing" aspect of our work that we have neglected to think? Have we taken our philosophy for granted? Are we perhaps subconsciously excusing ourselves from the hard work of thinking and writing because we see student personnel work as being a generalist's task?

When all is said and done, is being in the middle, is being a generalist, sufficient excuse for failure in leadership? In all the articles that were written about Berkeley, where was the student personnel position? I may be wrong, but not a single statement was made that related the student riots to student personnel work and its meaning. Why does the press not turn to us when a Berkeley happens? Why does the press turn to the political scientists, the sociologists and the professors of education? Are we a profession wrapped in silence simply because our aim is to avoid trouble and to keep students out of trouble? Why do we not speak out on public issues affecting students?

Perhaps all these questions can be reduced to two, and I hope you will be asking these questions of yourselves and each other throughout the Conference. The questions are: What is our vision of the contribution of student personnel to higher education? And how do we see ourselves in pursuit of that vision?

Let me tentatively suggest to you, merely as a starting point, a vision of engagement -- I should pronounce it "Ahn-gajz-mahn" an existential term for awareness, commitment, and, if you will indulge me again, consecration to do more than just be observers of student life, but to analyze it, live with it and try to understand it in student terms, not in our own. For this we need research -- our own or that of anyone we can recruit -- because without research we become patchwork administrators rushing from crisis to crisis, putting our puny little fingers into holes that appear in the administrative dam, and really not understanding what is going on. In these terms of administration by problem or crisis, T. V. Smith described research most appositely as "the community's emancipation from immediacy and unexpectedness." [T.V. Smith & L.D. White (eds), Chicago An Experiment in Social Science Research, University of Chicago Press, 1929, p. 223.]

The problem of freedom versus authority was, is, and will be with us forever. Let's face it. It is one of the dynamics of life, but especially life in a democratic society. It is also an essential part of student personnel process. It permeates everything we say and do. It affects every aspect of our task.

The student will, understandably, see that education defined in terms of acceptance of authority is absolutely opposed to education focused upon the objectives of initiative and independence of thought; that education for freedom cannot possibly relate to education for self-discipline; that education for personal ambition cannot be adapted to the ends of service for society. Student personnel cannot abrogate its responsibility here. We have no choice. Student personnel must be an educative force for freedom, for initiative, for independent thought and the pursuit of truth wherever it may lead.

Since as deans we are noted for "reserve" clauses, let me also point out that student personnel must be the educative force that reveals true freedom as operative only under law, for freedom without law degenerates into anarchy and the jungle imperative of the survival of the fittest. True freedom is limited by respect for the rights of my neighbor. And it is that limitation itself which guarantees freedom for both my neighbor and myself. True freedom is also conditioned by what I know -- another way of acting in conscience as they say. Once I know that a man has a right to a decent education, a right to vote, to own property, to

raise his children in peace -- once I know that fact, I am no longer free regarding it. I can debate ways and means perhaps, but in my mind, I have become a prisoner of the fact. To deny a man those rights because of race, color, creed, passion or prejudice, violates my integrity as a man. I cannot do harm to brother morally, without doing harm to myself.

Long ago Plato observed that "Republics must live by virtue," which is a way of saying that no real freedom can exist without justice for all; that no real justice can exist in a climate that excludes the common values of integrity, self-discipline, and unselfish service. In the long, hot days ahead, if we are to be effective against the forces of alienation and depersonalization, we shall have to devise ways and means whereby the student both learns and lives the lessons of freedom and thereby assumes a more significant role in his own education.

Finally, I can think of no more wonderful thing than for NASPA to confront these problems of professionalization, depersonalization in a frenetically changing society, freedom and student involvement in education. Here I turn from NASPA as a professional association to NASPA as a personal association because I mean, not NASPA, but you, the membership. I mean you -- for in the end, what NASPA does will be done by you; what NASPA is, will be what you are; what NASPA becomes, will rely heavily on what you make of yourself as a student personnel professional. You are the most important, and the richest resource of this Association. Your ideas -- and the more energetic, young, new and stimulating they are, the better -- your vision and perhaps even your dreams are the substance of our hope for the future.

Walt Whitman said it better than ever I could:

I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things,
It is not the earth, it is not America who is
great,
It is I who am great or to be great, it is YOU up
there, or any one,
It is to walk rapidly through civilizations,
governments, theories,
Through poems, pageants, shows, to form
individuals.
Underneath all, individuals.

I swear nothing is good to me now that ignores
individuals,
The American compact is altogether with
individuals,
The only government is that which makes minute of
individuals,
The whole theory of the universe is directed
unerringly to one single individual --
namely to YOU.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your patience, and God bless you. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: To you, Father Vic, Ph.D. in Romance languages, distinguished son of the church, our appreciation for that eloquent statement about us.

There are meetings scheduled this evening of various groups. There are buses waiting without.

The First General Session is adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at nine-forty o'clock...

SECOND GENERAL SESSION
Monday - April 5, 1965

The Second General Session convened in the Cotillion Room at nine-forty o'clock, President Yanitelli presiding.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: This morning we are not going to waste any time on a long (what Ed, himself calls) obituary. I simply give you Dr. Ed Williamson, Dean of Students of the University of Minnesota, and his assistant, John Cowan, the Technical Director of the Commission VIII study on the student -- to waste no time but to get you to the heart of the matter that brings you all here, Dr. Williamson. (Applause)

DEAN E. G. WILLIAMSON (Commission VIII Report, "What Freedoms Do Students Enjoy"; Dean of Students, University of Minnesota): Thank you. Father Vic, Fellow Deans, and Associates in Trouble: (Laughter) John and I have divided the assignment in this manner. I will briefly highlight some of the points made in Part I of the report, which will serve as a sort of a background for our later discussion. Then John will highlight some of the findings.

We assume that you have done your homework and that we do not need to read it aloud to you, (Laughter) that you are capable of self reading.

The heart of the problem, we assumed in our research, was the nature of academic freedom, and that this is the heart of the higher learning in American culture, and that we are presently engaged, in most campuses, in trying to explore and delineate and establish those kinds of freedoms or privileges which will further the higher learning.

This is no small task, because it is always done amidst chaos. We never have a quiet campus. But we Deans

of Students and all personnel workers have a rich opportunity to help students learn to define and to delineate the problem of authority which, for many of them, is a very confused concept and seems to contradict their notion of what freedom is in a democracy.

As you well know, the faculty has pretty largely won its battle for freedom in the German style of Lernfreiheit. For obscure historical reasons we have delayed almost a century with regard to helping the student learn to develop his form of freedom, Lernfreiheit.

I think this is the current revolution that is taking place on an increasing number of campuses: What is the desirable nature of the relationship between the student and the institution? What is the desirable nature of authority? What kind of freedoms should students enjoy with respect to their association within the institution of higher learning?

The problem in its current state, as far as we can trace it, was triggered by the 1947 declaration of the National Student Association. I would like to pay tribute to that organization as being very much of a leader, sometimes an irritant to the quiet of the campus. But that organization, together with other forces, including the AAUP and the Civil Liberties Union, have been forcing us, desirably and undesirably, to re-examine that which we have taken for granted, namely, the institution's authority over the student, and how that authority shall be exercised.

There are so many unsolved problems that I am not going to try to delineate them. But I would like to say that part of the confusion of the problem of delineating desirable, necessary academic freedoms, arises out of the confusion on the part of the student as to which uniform he is wearing, because he is a citizen entitled to all of the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship, all of the freedoms, all of the Bill of Rights, and the like; but he is also a student in an organization which we call a college or university. And the confusion of these two statuses has added to the difficulty of a straightforward attack on the problem of delineating freedoms.

I should like to mention in passing that we also have the dead hand of history, the heritage of the colonial college style with us in many campuses, in which the concept of in loco parentis has been the source of irritation and revolt on the part of students. This has to do with the nature of the use of the institution's authority with regard to a number of matters which the students increasingly refer to as private affairs.

I think this revolution will ultimately lead to a clarification and a delineation, and hopefully the enactment of desirable freedoms on the part of students so that they

will know what freedoms they may enjoy, and what the institution feels are necessary restraints, if the mission of higher learning is to come about. But we still have the vestige of the colonial regimentation.

It is true that about the middle of the 19th Century the benign family relationship came to slowly replace the harsh regimentation of the colonial college. But as I say, there are still vestiges that we have not yet got rid of. We should not be surprised if these vestiges are increasingly irritating to our students. But the kindly, benign Alma Mater has gradually come to replace the in loco parentis of the earlier days.

Now, we are not entirely free agents in any college these days to establish or restrict freedom. Increasingly the courts are beginning to give us guidelines as to procedural due process and even substantive due process, and the exercise of the institution's authority will, I believe, in the next decade increasingly be subjected to some kind of scrutiny from the courts.

I think it would be a wise Dean of Students who worked with his local student leaders to try to anticipate the restraints upon the exercise of his authority over students without waiting for court action, because I do believe that already we can see that there are certain legal criteria which have relevancy to the delineation of desirable and desired freedoms. One is the relevancy to the mission of the institution, of the exercise of authority, or the establishment of rules of restraint. Increasingly I think we need to converse with our students, "Is this rule necessary to achieve the mission of the institution?"

There is a second criterion which I think we ought to apply ourselves in the delineation of freedom without waiting for the court, and that is the reasonableness of the restraint of all the individual's private life.

If we seek to apply these two criteria, or principles, without waiting for the courts, I think we can get through this revolution with a great deal of profit for the institutions and for the furthering of the academic enterprise.

You see, I am really presupposing that certain kinds of conflict are destructive of this higher learning, rather than facilitating. I believe in controversy, but not in destructive controversy. I believe in the clash of opinions, but not in the kind of phenomena which have taken place on many campuses recently in which there has been a clash of authority in a destructive nature.

Back of this whole problem of desirable and desired academic freedom for students lies a fundamental philosophic

question, and I would hope that as a result of our research that all Deans of Students would become leaders of seminars on their campuses to help students examine thoughtfully what it is they think is the nature of freedom, because I believe that many of them have very immature concepts of the nature of freedom. Some of them think that it is freedom from restraint. In this document we have spelled out a few of the different competing concepts.

I hope you will have an opportunity to hear President Gideonse this afternoon as he reviews for us in a very learning and incisive way the competing concepts of freedom, because I really think back of the whole problem is the student's failure or inability to understand that freedom is not what they think it is.

I like to tell my students that many of them conceive of heaven as being a deanless campus. (Laughter) It would be interesting to try that experimentally, wouldn't it? Well, I am away from home now and giving my students a chance.

I think ultimately students must come to understand that in an organized society freedom is within restraint. Now the debate will begin as to what restraints are reasonable and relevant to the mission of the institution.

What freedoms do students desire?

Well, in the revolution today we can identify at various stages of delineation a number of freedoms that students desire, not on every campus in the same measure, but in terms of the general situation.

One of the most controversial and one of the most precious freedoms that students desire today is the freedom to discuss issues and problems of their own choosing. This immediately leads us into the concept that some ideas, and some issues, and some controversy is dangerous, and it is. Controversy is always dangerous. But we are going to have to learn to deal with this in a straightforward manner, with this desire for freedom to discuss issues and problems of choosing.

Secondly, the students desire on an increasing number of campuses to choose speakers who will present controversial ideas. It is a very great temptation of the adolescent, which he cannot resist, to bring the most controversial speaker on the most controversial issue to the campus. Nobody wants to listen to a safe and sane speaker.

Thirdly, the freedom to editorialize, especially about Deans of Students. And this is a much discussed and not clearly yet established freedom.

Another freedom which increasingly students are asking for, and I think deservedly, is the freedom to participate in discussions preparatory to decision making. This particular freedom, of course, gives us a great deal of opportunity to teach the students that a university is not a democracy, it is a corporation, dedicated to the maturing of youth through instruction. And this is a new concept for many students, because they seem to carry over from their status as citizens the notion that they have the same citizenship rights within the institution. But it is a reasonable freedom, at least for discussion purposes, that they should learn to participate in the decision-making in a mature way by learning all of the complications that enter into decisions, and especially those decisions which affect them, such as rules and regulations governing behavior. We have a long way to go before this freedom to participate in the governing by rule making is well established.

Now, of course, it is one of the characteristics of American culture that we all want freedom but we do not want responsibility in the exercise of freedom. So again there is an opportunity in the seminar method of discussing desirable and desired academic freedom for students. As I state it ungrammatically, freedom is what you do with it. It has to be earned, and you have to learn how to use it. It is not merely the absence of restraint or authority. It is a sobering kind of maturing, searching for the responsible use of one's freedom to achieve desired and desirable goals in personal development.

I had a very interesting experience last week in a Junior College in California in observing the unrest on that particular campus, which had not yet reached the rioting stage. But the students were asking about their freedom from the faculty's urge to raise their cultural level of taste. (Laughter) That was an interesting deviation on the problem of defining freedom. They said, "Why do we have to go to lectures and concerts when we don't want to?" And the faculty was playing around with the notion that you should want to, and therefore they were bringing all kinds of pressure to bear upon students, and the students were beginning to resist and stiffen.

My contribution, as an outsider, was to bring them together to discuss why the faculty feels it has a responsibility to raise the cultural level of taste of these students and also to discuss whether or not they had the right to be tasteless.

I hope that as a result of my serving as a catalytic agent that now discussions will ensue and that maybe the students will begin to understand, maybe for the first time, that it is the function of higher learning to elevate taste and esthetics, not merely to cram the cranium with facts, but to surround the student with higher levels of taste.

It is an interesting variation on the usual problem of academic freedom.

There are other kinds of discussion and angles of freedom which I will not take the time to go into.

This particular Association is composed of those who have the sometimes unhappy privilege of enforcing regulations which the students had not participated in making. Sometimes we have the unhappy responsibility of enforcing regulations that are not writ, but are assumed and implied in the mission of higher learning itself. We are the individuals who specialize in saying, "No, you cannot do that."

So in a sense we are the target, as we should be recognized, for the revolt against authority. This Association has wrestled with this problem, this function, this specialization in negativism over the years. It was about 1960-61 when the Executive Committee appointed a Commission to formulate an approach to the problem of students and their advocacies and expressions on social issues. This was about the time of the innovation of the sit-in and other forms of expression of points of view, which is a dimension of academic freedom.

The Commission has worked long and arduously and seriously in trying a novel approach. Everybody has opinions about academic freedom, but we have few facts available as to its prevalence.

So we decided that we would, with a kind of internal consistency, apply the method of academic inquiry to understanding the problem of academic freedom for students. We would not advocate anything except the academic method of inquiry applied to this particular dimension of college life.

So with your generous assistance we have collected data from between 700 and 800 four-year institutions out of 1,000 accredited ones -- a remarkable amount of data, a remarkable response. About two and a half to three times as much as is usually found in the responses of this type of questionnaire study.

As you know, we asked each of you to be our local agent in cajoling, persuading, seducing the president (laughter) to reveal how he operates with regard to establishment of academic freedom. We also asked you to fill out the questionnaire, because you, too, are an agent in this particular resolution and delineation of freedoms, desirable and desired freedoms. We asked you to enlist the cooperation of any members of the faculties who served as a chairman of student affairs. You will recall also we asked the president of the student body and the editor of the student newspaper.

I will recall for you briefly our concept, our

hypothesis was this: Part of the difficulty of resolving the controversy about academic freedom and getting on with the business of higher learning may arise out of failure to understand each other's perception of what is the desired form of academic freedom. We wanted to see whether it was congruity or incongruity. John will report some of the results there.

With the generous support of the Hazen Foundation, and with their very helpful reactions, consultations, we have all the data in, and a large part of it has been analyzed and has been issued in preliminary form, some 24 chapters of technical analysis.

In case any of you want the original data, just write to us and we will be glad to give them to you. This morning we will not give you the full 24 chapters, but we will give you enough to indicate some of the findings.

Now let me say that the original Commission was enlarged so that it would be much more representative of the various agents and components of the academic community. We have added two students, W. Dennis Shaul of Harvard University and Donald Stewart of the University of Alabama, both of them active as undergraduates and now in law school. We added two Presidents, because Presidents are crucial agents, President Borton and President Babbidge. We added two professors who had been clearly identified with the revolution in the establishment of academic freedom for faculty, Professor Pollitt and Professor White.

The statistics are still in the process, of course, of being analyzed. We are satisfied as to the sincerity and the candor and openness of the responses. Truly amazing. We were concerned lest the urge to concealment would be so overpowering that we would not get full answers.

You know, after all, the decisions about whether a Malcolm is to be invited to the campus is not made in a public forum. Decisions of that nature are made privately, and sometimes we thought that the presidents and deans would not be candid in telling us how they reasoned about the problem of whether or not this is a particular freedom at this particular moment that can be permitted without bringing the institution to an end.

We have all kinds of internal checks of consistency and truthfulness which make us see that our data are important.

Let me give you just one final point before John gets to the summary.

Aristotle said that politics is the art of the possible. Recently an administrator adapted that to the definition of administration as the art of the possible.

This raises some puzzling questions as to whether or not the decisions about academic freedom, such as controversial speakers, are decided on the basis of the principle of expediency or on the basis of the higher principle of learning.

You have in your document a quotation from the former Chancellor, Capen, of Buffalo, in which he says no price is too high for academic freedom. This is a kind of reassuring guideline which is not held by every President. And you can make up your own mind as to whether or not your President agrees with Capen, or whether he agrees with Aristotle.

At any rate, the President and the Dean of Students must make up his mind in some way or other about what kind of price he is willing and able to pay if the students bring a controversial speaker on campus, or if the editor exercises editorial freedom in certain ways rather than others.

We deans live day by day with this kind of decision making, and I suppose all of us develop an operating philosophy or a set of principles or guidelines, and we designed our questionnaire with this particular kind of psychology of decision making in mind.

This much of general background for you. I would now like to call upon John Cowan, my associate, who will give you some of the factual summary. Then, as you know, there will be a time for you to raise questions, and time for our reactors to give us their judgments and their reaction to the study as thus far progressed. (Applause)

MR. JOHN COWAN (Technical Director, Commission VIII Study): I have some trepidation in following Dean Williamson to the podium. I am charged here with a responsibility that I do not particularly enjoy in the sense that it took you, each of you, perhaps an hour and a half, two, perhaps even three or four hours to fill out this questionnaire. We have more than 18,000 data cards, each of which has 80 columns filled. The computers have blown a few fuses here and there and our programmers have gone crazy. And we have stacks of computer readouts at least three or four feet high, and I am supposed to tell you all of what it means in about ten minutes. This is impossible, of course.

I would like to highlight, however, just what we have mentioned in the paper that you have before you.

In response to the open-ended question regarding the statement that we have made to the Presidents and Deans that it is suggested that an essential part of the education of each student is the freedom to hear, to critically examine and to express viewpoints on a range of positions held and advocated regarding issues that divide our society, our cod-

ing of these responses showed us very clearly that the Presidents and that the Deans of Students by and large agree with this philosophy or this understanding of freedom.

We have placed in the paper some very selected quotes from the Presidents, unidentified because we have held to their confidentiality. I might add here that even Dean Williamson has not read these. He does not know what his own President says with regard to this on this questionnaire. Let me quote one President, which is to some extent typical:

We believe at [our university] that a central concern of education is the preparation of an enlightened, a thinking people who will make for a better government and a better society. This can best be accomplished in an atmosphere of academic freedom, permitting individuals to understand controversial issues as well as those which conform to accepted tenets of our society. Only in this way, we believe, will young people learn to make wise choices; to tolerate the rights of others; and to reason and come to logical conclusions on personal, community, national and world problems.

At the same time we believe that some vigilance must be exercised by administration and faculty to the end that the wishes of a small group of students will not undermine the major purposes of the college education nor mar the responsible and constructive image of the institution. We have found it possible to harmonize these concerns within a dynamic institutional setting to the general satisfaction of faculty, students, and trustees, although there are no firm or fixed answers in any of these situations.

Seventy percent of the Presidents agreed with this statement of freedom; 80 percent of the Deans of Students, in most institutions, in most types of institutions, the Deans of Students more frequently than Presidents. In one particular type, the technical types of institutions, the Deans far and above the Presidents agreed with this kind of freedom.

An additional 14 percent of the Presidents and 13 percent of the Deans agreed in general, but had some restrictions. They wanted to make it very clear that this freedom of students must be exercised with responsibility and it must be exercised critically.

Furthermore, 10 percent of the Presidents and 6 percent of the Deans made a statement which we judge to be an essential agreement, but there were clear and defined limits of a political or religious nature. One Dean made the following comment which illustrates what we have categorized

as restricted agreement. I quote in part:

In general the above statement is part of the philosophy of this college; however, as a Catholic college there are fundamental concepts of natural law, dogma, and morals which would prevent this statement from being accepted in an absolute manner.

A very, very small percentage indeed disagreed with the statement.

This in general shows us that the principle of freedom, of academic freedom for students is very widely held. The ideal of the free forum, if you will, is widely held. The problem of instrumenting this principle, however, was something again.

We found that this was held more frequently in the New England area, the middle Atlantic states, and the North Central states, was questioned somewhat more frequently in the Northwestern and Western regions. The private, non-sectarian universities and the private, non-sectarian liberal arts colleges and very large public institutions, universities, were particularly in agreement with this philosophy of academic freedom.

On the other hand, teachers' colleges, Catholic universities and Catholic liberal arts colleges in particular at the other extreme tended to question or place restrictions on the absolute concept, as they interpreted our absolute concept of academic freedom of students.

When questioned about the nature of students' freedom -- because there is current in our society and among some individuals the concept that either the college is free and open and completely open at that, or, if it is not, that it is then closed -- when analyzed with this concept in mind, in terms of the questions that we had asked (and now we are speaking only for the Presidents), we found that no President said that he would question the advisability of students speaking to every issue listed, or inviting every speaker listed, or every mode of expression that we had listed. So in this sense there were no closed colleges.

On the other hand, at the far extreme, the most permissive answers that were given, there were only three percent, or approximately 20-21 colleges out of the 695 who approved, of the Presidents that said we will permit this in the extreme.

This answer by polarity seemed to leave us in a position where we could not describe the remaining 97 percent of the colleges, so we moved to what we conceived to be a more complex and yet more realistic understanding of the

situation. By technical process of factor analysis, we discovered that there are dimensions of academic freedom, if you will, in terms of the question that we asked.

First there emerged what we called a "topics factor," or a factor of issues. This was regarding discussions of such things as federal aid to Yugoslavia, sale of U.S. farm products to Russia or Soviet satellites, and so forth, discussion of local fair housing legislation, discussion by students and making public statements regarding the abolition of inter-racial marriage laws within their states.

Second there emerged a factor composed of "religious issues," such issues or topics as one Bible for all Christians, or abolition of prayer in public schools, or the abolition of the Index of Forbidden Books by Catholics. This was a second dimension, if you will, of freedom.

With regard to our list of seventeen speakers, there emerged either two or three factors or dimensions depending on the particular group that we were speaking of. The Presidents classified these speakers, in effect, in three groups, what we called in our technical reports the "acceptable" speakers, which included among them Martin Luther King and Barry Goldwater, and fortunately the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren. (Laughter)

At the far extreme in the Presidents' questionnaires we found a dimension which we considered to be the highly controversial speakers. This includes, for example, Daniel Rubin of the Communist party. It included George Lincoln Rockwell and Malcolm X. It included Oswald Mosley as well.

A larger group, the middle group, the ones that perhaps are more relevant in terms of getting to our students were "controversial," and we called them this. This included Governor Wallace and James Hoffa, and a number of other persons.

So we do break the speakers apart and consider them quite differently.

A fifth identifiable factor is that of what we considered as, in a sense, the core of the research, the mode of expression, whether students could petition or whether they could organize a group in the general sense to advocate an "extreme" position, or whether they had editorial freedom. These are modes of expression -- or whether they could partake of partisan political activity on the campus.

Finally, there was emerging a sixth dimension which cut across the speakers and the issues and the modes of expression and came out with what my staff and I considered to be essentials of the civil rights movement. This is contem-

porary, this is a contemporary dimension and probably would not have been found two or three or four years prior to our study, and may not be found in several years to come. But this included responses to students picketing, and students sitting-in, and students organizing a group to advocate an extreme position, discussion of local fair housing legislation, and included the speakers Reverend Martin Luther King, and Robert Moses of SNCC.

We do not assert this will be the final delineation, but in terms of the questions we ask at this time in history and in terms of the technical questions we use, these are the emerging dimensions of student academic freedom as we see it now.

In regard to the freedom to discuss issues, we found that three-quarters of the Presidents reported that student groups could discuss and make known their positions, even if unpopular, thirteen of the fourteen topics we had listed.

There is a beautiful little document, if you have not read it, a speech by Thorndike in 1934 regarding the discussion of controversial issues.

It would seem to me our evidence does say to us, students do, can and have discussed controversial issues in our days, and there has in some sense already come a revolution here, or an evolutionary process.

There were two issues that brought about perhaps more restrictions than others in terms of the Presidents' responses.

One was the issue of the United States distribution of birth control information to underdeveloped countries. This is currently a very controversial and significant issue. It has some restriction in some parts of the country and in some types of institutions. Notably here, because we are dealing with a doctrinal issue in part as well as an issue of state or national policy, there was considerable restriction reflected from among the Roman Catholic Liberal Arts colleges in particular, and to some extent among the Roman Catholic Universities.

Likewise the discussion of the topic, abolition of inter-racial marriage laws brought us a regional kind of restriction which is certainly understandable in terms of our contemporary situation.

As we moved to the freedom to explore various modes of advocacy, we realized rather rapidly that our Presidents tell us very clearly that at least most of them do, that on-campus advocacy of an election of a candidate in a national election is an almost universal freedom on our campuses.

There again there are some restrictions here, notably -- undoubtedly coming from the charters of the state universities -- on the partisan political issue. But in the main this is won.

Then we move to the advocacy of a viewpoint by publication of a viewpoint by a student governing board. Well over 90 percent of the campuses, according to the Deans of Students, are permitted to give a resolution. It is interesting to note here in terms of congruity that the Deans of Students and the Presidents see a bit less freedom than the student body presidents in terms of what they can accomplish or what they can do. The students find this to be free.

Right to petition government agencies and officials is likewise very frequently and quite well established in the main. Again, there is some restriction here. It is of a minor sort, one or two percent, as one finds as he reflects on the data very closely, and this is found in the main among the publicly supported institutions, because, I think, they are reacting to the fact that the petition is going to public agencies or public officials.

On the other extreme here, we discover that the right of students, as you will, or the freedom of students to sit-in or picket is much more cautiously approached by Deans and by Presidents. And the students do not at all see eye to eye with the Deans and the Presidents here. Thirty percent of the Presidents, roughly, said that students would be permitted to sit-in at a local lunch counter. Only fourteen percent, as I recall, of the student editors said that they would be, that the administration would be quite permissive on this item. This was close to the response to picketing a public meeting.

There is much to be done here, I am sure, in terms of defining and delineating these kinds of freedoms in terms of the mission of the university.

I will move very rapidly through the speakers' list, because I mentioned it a moment ago. On the one extreme we have approximately 90 percent of the Presidents saying, "Certainly Earl Warren can come to our campus." This is the far extreme, of course. (Laughter) There were a few Presidents who said they could not say, or did not respond, and there were perhaps as many as six -- I do not recall the exact figure here -- who said for some reason, and we do not know the reasons, they would question the advisability of Earl Warren on the campus. (Laughter)

On the other extreme, we have George Lincoln Rockwell. Twenty-nine percent of the Presidents said that Rockwell either could speak or had spoken on the campus, 17 Presidents in all said that he had spoken; 59 percent

would question the advisability of having George Lincoln Rockwell on the campus.

Again, we do not know the criteria they used for questioning the advisability. We do have some clue here in the fact that some Presidents from the otherwise very liberal, very free universities made a double check here. They said, "Yes, he could speak. We have in effect an 'open speakers' policy." And they also checked the other extreme. But personally I think they were saying, "I would question the advisability of having him on the campus." These are the two extremes, the subtle nuances in each of the responses to each of the speakers, we simply cannot bring out here. If we do get our highly technical reports published, then you will be able to read and dig into those with us.

I would like to go very briefly into student editorial freedom, particularly here as seen by the students themselves.

Sixty percent of the editors report that they do not have to submit editorial copy to anyone, no one at all, prior to publication. Of those that do submit editorial copy, a small percentage report that they have been censored. Fifteen percent altogether report that they have been censored, prior censorship, during the two and a half years' period covered by the questionnaire.

None of the editors of large, published daily, newspapers claim to have been censored with regard to editorials written on controversial subjects. About 10 percent of the editors in smaller public universities and private and protestant liberal arts colleges say they have been censored. A quarter of the editors in teachers colleges and almost one-third of the editors on Catholic campuses, however, claim to have been censored prior to publishing.

This does not mean -- the fact that a relatively small percentage, from one perspective, one criteria, one place of evaluating the data -- this does not mean that editors are not held accountable by their readers, and this includes students, teachers, administrators, off-campus readers as well, for the statements made in the editorial columns. Indeed the editors in large public universities, while not censored, are certainly held accountable for their editorial content. Approximately one-third of the editors of all types of institutions indicate that they have been privately reprimanded or censored for taking extreme stands on controversial issues. This is not always by the administration, not always at all. I have not broken down this data here in this report. Usually by the administration, but not always.

Indeed, in Roman Catholic colleges we find particularly that the faculty members react to the student editorials perhaps more than the other types of institutions, the

public or private or protestant institutions.

Almost half the editors indicated that they have voluntarily refrained from printing inflammatory editorials because they themselves had discovered facts, either by the process of the administrative backgrounding or by their own journalistic searching, which indicated that a proposed editorial at that particular time would not be appropriate. This was their own decision, and it was a self-imposed restraint.

Let me comment briefly on what Dean Williamson has already mentioned regarding what desirable freedoms remain to be established. This is a question I think we will all agree which cannot be answered by statistics as we have them. In effect, this is a value question. It requires us to search the criteria to understand the concepts of freedom, to come together in discussions to determine that freedom.

On the one hand we have yardsticks, or criteria, represented particularly among the current statements, the draft of the statement, by the American Association of University Professors, which would suggest outer limits, if you will, for students' freedom for inviting speakers of their own choice.

Let me read to you -- and I do not know if this is current, because this statement is in a draft form, as I understand -- the statement to the effect that:

Any person who is presented by a recognized student organization should be allowed to speak on a college or university campus. Institutional control of the use of campus facilities by student organizations for meetings and other organizational purposes should not be employed as a device to censor or prohibit controversial speakers or the discussion of controversial topics. The only controls which may be imposed are those required by orderly scheduling of the use of space.

This is one approach, one yardstick. This is one place for beginning the evaluation of the kind of data we have.

We could begin from the point of view of Aristotle's dictum regarding administration as the art of the possible. The Presidents, I think for Deans of Students, in their responses indicated to us that they were not willing to say absolutely that any student group could bring any speaker at any time on any topic. Freedom, as they perceived it, was certainly not absolute.

There may well be no one single answer to the issue of desired, desirable, and achievable freedom. Our studies reveal the facts as to the extent certain student

freedoms are currently enjoyed and where they are exercised. Our final report will specify these and delineate them in much more detail. There is currently diversity, and we suggest that the great American principle of desirable diversity, of institutional programs, practices and policies may be as relevant to the establishment of academic freedom as it is to other dimensions of higher learning.

Again, we have constitutional considerations and legal considerations to take into account. We also have the consideration of the various types of institutions in terms of their current definitions of educational philosophy and what is their educational mission.

In the light of the establishing of our freedoms, we discovered in our questionnaire that in those institutions where there is significant student participation, where students, for example, are voting members of policy making committees and are privileged to argue their case before the academic senate, there is indeed greater freedom to hear controversial speakers discuss topics openly and to express their viewpoints more frequently. We might have much more analysis to be done here.

We do not say at this time that one is the cause of the other. The relationship, however, is very clear.

In only four of ten institutions do students, through their student government or other student organizations, enjoy the right to review proposed policy changes governing students with regard to controversial issues, or give their expressions on them, prior to adoption by the university. This may give us some indication of the extent to which students participate in the policy making process with regard to student activities.

This privilege of prior review was found in as many as 60 percent of the large public universities, and as few as one-fourth of the Catholic universities.

I might add here, simply parenthetically, it is not in the report at this time, that with regard to the Catholic institutions here, I think it must be realized that there are other methods than the open discussion of policy making. We found that the right to petition with regard to the change of policy was more prevalent in the Roman Catholic institutions. This has not been spelled out in any of our reports. At the time, that is currently in analysis.

In general we found that when students were participants in policy making at the more significant levels, that is, that they had the right to vote, to present their case in an academic senate or to the faculty, along with their committee, the Presidents were much more likely in these schools to appraise and judge this participation as

being beneficial to the university.

I will end with reading our summary -- a brief one indeed. It should probably be entitled "conclusion." I say:

"After achieving this stage of analysis in our study, we have reached the personal position that the issue to be resolved is not the simplistic one of freedom or unfreedom, but one of searching thoughtfully, and with intensity and vigor, to formulate and delineate, in thoughtful seminars, what is possible as an approximation of the desired forms of freedom relevant and basic to the achievement of the constantly reexamined mission of the institution. We are convinced that, coupled with the presidents' adherence to desirable principles of freedom, there is indeed, currently, sufficient freedom on the vast number of campuses to engage in this type of academic inquiry. Such an inquiry seems to us to be the most basic of all freedoms and the one most relevant to the mission of higher learning. For this is the universal mission of the university: to teach students how to use the academic methods of thoughtful inquiry, especially with regard to controversial and divisive issues and personalities." (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Is Dean Robinson in the hall?

We will now observe all the rules and regulations for proceeding up the stairs for a cup of coffee, without killing each other. Reassemble at ten-thirty.

... The Conference recessed at ten-fifteen o'clock ...

THIRD GENERAL SESSION
Monday - April 5, 1965

The Third General Session convened in the Cotillion Room at ten forty-five o'clock, President Yanitelli presiding.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: We have some announcements from O. D. Roberts.

... Conference announcements ...

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN ROBERTS: Please note the agenda for tonight: an 8:30 general meeting, followed by seminars at 9:00 o'clock, and a general session back here in the Cotillion Room at 10:00 p.m. to discuss the restructuring of NASPA.

Some of you have had difficulty in making up your minds as to which of the seminars you would like to attend this afternoon and tomorrow. I would inform you that all of them are going to be recorded and will be in the Proceedings.

There will not be a published roster here at the Conference because of the large attendance and the lateness of registration.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I will now ask our panel of reactors, members of Commission VIII, to come up here.

I would like to introduce the members of Commission VIII who worked so diligently on this project. Beginning on my left and your far right, Dean Don Anderson. Would you rise, Don? Dave Robinson, Armour Blackburn, Jim Kreuzer. On my right, and your far left, Dean Pat Ratterman, Dennis Shaul, former president of the National Student Association. Tom Edwards, President Borton, Will Blaesser.

Our panel of reactors: Dr. Barbara Kirk, University of California; Dr. Martha Peterson, University of Wisconsin; Father Andrew Greely, National Opinion Research Center; Dr. Helen White, University of Wisconsin; Dr. Phillip Moneypenney, University of Illinois; and Stephen Robbins, President of the National Student Association.

I just want to set some ground rules. Our procedure will be to call on the panel of reactors to start the discussion going. Briefly they will make a statement. Then we will call for a discussion from the members of the Commission interacting with the panel of reactors, and the floor will be open.

At this point, I would like to ask Dr. Barbara Kirk to open the discussion.

DR. BARBARA KIRK (Panel Member, Commission VIII; ACPA, University of California): The American College Personnel Association wishes to provide its strongest applause and acclaim and plaudits to NASPA for undertaking this project. We feel that our brother organization has both assumed leadership in this most important territory in a pioneering way, but also I think we especially admire the approach that NASPA used.

More important, I think, from my standpoint, even than the important results this project has demonstrated, has been the approach of a reasoned research project in an area of what is now really very strong feelings. I can especially say this coming from, you know where I do. (Laughter)

As Dean Williamson so beautifully says, the application of the method of academic inquiry to the academic community is something which is greatly needed, is a very important principle to be established.

This research approach is in itself, as I think was mentioned this morning at our breakfast meeting, a method in itself of resolving controversy. In essence, it practices what it preaches.

I particularly admire the total methodology of this project. The methodology is very carefully and very finely conceived. The dull and tedious data collection -- I am speaking now from my reading, which I did with real pleasure -- of the 24 chapters that so far have been produced, and it is a real pleasure. They are beautifully written, most readable, in spite of the fact that they contain considerable statistics. But in the collection of this data, the careful, thorough follow-up is really very much to be applauded, particularly since the study would not have had the results it has if this care had not been taken.

Due to this painstaking methodology, the very splendid response has been obtained which is remarkable in view of the difficulty of handling the questionnaires, the complexity of the topic, and the amount of time, thought and effort it must have taken to respond.

The coverage is very ambitious. It is reassuring that these returns have been made in actually quite a representative fashion.

The study is beautifully designed. It is a huge task brought to terms, brought to handleable terms, reduced to size. It is really molded and melded in such a way that the essence has been obtained and the most data integrated. Even the descriptive data are of interest, apart from the analysis. The description even of the absence of respondents on the campus is really quite interesting. For example,

the Student Affairs Committee Chairmen in some cases were faculty members, in some cases Deans of Students, and in some cases absent. Even this is information which adds very appreciably to what we know.

The analysis of the data is exemplary. The thing that I like to point to here is the fact that the questionnaire plan is of particularity, rather than generality. Topics were picked, names of speakers, so that specific responses that were meaningful in a generality could be obtained.

I have just a few points regarding the results. I think John Cowan mentioned this this morning.

The questionnaires, the project itself, of course affects the data, affects the answers. There is no question but what the members of the various groups on campuses asked to respond are influenced by the very fact of having the questionnaire, and having been required to respond.

I see smiles among the group. I see that you recognize that this must have occurred in your own experience. But we do not know to what extent the effect of the questionnaire influenced the data, but in any event I think, at least in my opinion, we can be very glad that this took place, because this in itself, as Dean Williamson says, starts the reform. It has an effect, and the effect is in the direction this Commission is concerned with.

In my perception, the responses, the returns are notably rewarding. It is very gratifying to see the extent to which there is adherence to convictions, to ideal philosophy, to ideals and principles. Actually, as some of you must have been, I was surprised and very much gratified at the extent really of liberalism, of contemporariness, of up-to-dateness, flexibility, moving with the times and change of the respondents generally throughout.

I have been saving a cartoon in this respect to share with you. It is one by Lichty on the Coast. It has a frowning mother with a bedraggled teenaged daughter walking along and the daughter is saying, "But Daphne is only sixteen and her mother lets her get arrested at student demonstrations." (Laughter)

This is my perception of the fact that the Presidents and the campuses are keeping up.

Another very important contribution from my point of view is the fact that in general -- not always, of course, but in general -- there is agreement within the campus of perception of all of those sampled. I think this is quite remarkable, that there is as close agreement of perceptions as occurred in these responses.

Of major importance is the finding, it seems to me, that there is no either/or, that there were really no extremes, no closed campuses, no totally open campuses.

It is a very important conception that there is a differentiation for different dimensions and a point along the continuum for each campus on each dimension.

Just a word about what I would hope for the future. I was yearning, as I was reading this excellent report, to put both of the project people right back to work, along with Commission VIII. This study describes the views, and for the first time is a very pioneering description of what exists on the campuses and what is currently permitted.

I would like also to know, and would hope that Commission VIII or some other organization in the future, would examine how these changes that currently exist came about, what has been the process of changing of attitudes, in order that we may also know and understand the changes that may be about to occur.

I would like to know, through research and investigation if possible, how most effectively we may communicate with students regarding the educational philosophies which our institutions hold, especially perhaps in the current somewhat (becoming more so) legalistic age.

I would like, third, to know how to deal with the establishment of limits, where limits must be established, and, lastly, of course, how best to deal in a constructive and productive way with those instances in which limits are exceeded.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you very much, Dr. Kirk.

Dr. Martha Peterson, University of Wisconsin.

DR. MARTHA PETERSON (Panel Member, Commission VIII; NAWDC, University of Wisconsin): First, I would echo Barbara's comments about the excellent quality of the report.

If we seem a little calmer than some of the rest of you, I think I could point out that for three months we have been reading a continued story about liberalism on the campus, about freedom on the campus, and it really was a very comfortable experience for me.

I recall a saying we have in our family, "I met a smart man today; he thinks as I do." This was my reaction to the description of what is going on on the campuses, that it was much more of the kind of climate that I found suitable and right than I had anticipated when Ed Williamson first started the study.

I would comment on the carefulness, the imagination of the study. I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to Ed Williamson and John Cowan and the members of Commission VIII and NASPA, because there is much energy, time and self-discipline in this kind of study. When you see the total report, you will know that.

I wonder how long we will wait for another such report. Will we ten years from now in our spring convention be citing the Williamson-Cowan report of 1964, or will we in the meantime make some more contributions? If we act as we have in the past, I suspect this will be a high point, and we will wait fifteen years to do something again. If we wait that long, our campuses may be the deanless heaven that Dean Williamson spoke about earlier. I am not sure. In other words, I hope this is a pacemaker, not a high water mark in studies of this kind.

In writing down reactions as I read the report, I found that I accepted what was in it almost without question. I have few comments to make. Mostly I did what Barbara was doing in the end, moving ahead and saying, "What can we make about this?" Most of my remarks will be in the direction of "What does this point to?" I expect that may be a mark of the excellentness of the study, the fact that we are not quarreling about it, but that we are moving ahead into additional questions that are unanswered by the report.

I wondered at first whether or not such a study would really get at the climate on the campuses. Ed Williamson has spoken to that this morning. He has spoken of the candor of the responses. I think the agreement among the responses among the different people queried is an indication that this is a fairly open, fairly frank report.

Of course, I think any one of us will wonder whether or not one's perception of one's own campus is actually real. You know, taking it in another area, we all do not want to be paternalistic, and we make many statements about this. But we do not really know, when the students come in, whether we are paternalistic or not.

When you talk about freedom on the campus, you make certain statements, but is this the real status as it exists, or will we, as we move five and six years along into new crises, will we find that we really were not very free, that our statements were not really being implemented on the frontiers? I do not know about that.

For that reason, I would be interested in seeing Ed Williamson and John Cowan identify perhaps a dozen campuses that are representative of different kinds of climates and freedom in these different factors they have identified, their different points, and then I wish we could persuade an Esther Rauschenbush, or someone of that kind, to do a very

deep study of these campuses, how they got where they are, and what is going to happen with them in the future.

I would like to see some case studies of some individual campuses. I would like also to know how much the present situation has to do with the result of the study. I think most of us think we are in a time of crisis and change. How would these questionnaires have been answered five years ago? How will they be answered five years hence? When John was reporting this morning I thought, what would a question on Vietnam do to the topics involved in it? In other words, in a year's time we have moved into new topics. I would hope some provision might be made for a continuing study of this kind through several student generations, and perhaps through several faculty and deans' generations, to get an estimate of how rapidly we are changing, and how we do change, how transitory certain pressures are, how our freedoms are tested.

It is in the areas that are of most importance that we are testing freedoms now, and we are arriving at some positions. Maybe sit-ins are the testing areas at the moment. What will be the testing areas five years from now, and how congruent are the backgrounds of these?

I would hope the study could continue as a long-range one. I wish I knew on some of these campuses where there is a very close unanimity -- what? 71 percent of college presidents agree that academic freedom for students, freedom in these areas, is important -- how are things with the faculty on those campuses? I know this was a study of students, not of faculty. We may say we have arrived at academic freedom for faculty, but I do not think this is true in the same degree in all campuses.

I would like to know how things are in the regions. I would like to know how congruent regional policies are with faculty policy, and policy for students.

I would like to know in what 5 percent of the institutions do they have a great many restrictions. These are questions that pop in my mind.

There are random comments I jotted down on different parts of the report. Barbara covered some of these.

The completeness of the response is amazing to me, particularly knowing my own procrastination in answering questionnaires. I think it is a tribute to the quality of this study, and also the urgency of our concern.

The unemotional responses of college editors interested me. I do not know what I expected, but I guess I thought college editors are sort of firebrands, and maybe this is dangerous to say -- I hope no one reports this to our editor back home -- but their responses to this ques-

tionnaire seem just a bit more insipid than I expected college editors to be. I was surprised at that.

The overwhelming support of freedom on the campuses in areas relating to such issues as techniques and speakers makes me wonder a bit where the areas of restriction lie. I would like to know what a similar kind of study in the area of social freedoms and personal privacy might develop. I would be interested in knowing what a similar study perhaps on classroom freedoms, the freedom to learn in the organized structured classroom situation, how this would be viewed by Presidents, faculty, and Deans of Students.

I guess my conclusion would have to be summed up in these words: Since this study could be done so stunningly as it was by Commission VIII and your staff, why haven't we done it before? Why hasn't NASPA done this before? When are they going to start on another study?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Wow!

Father Andrew Greely of the National Opinion Research Center.

I have to interrupt for an emergency call from one of the colleges. (Laughter)

... Announcement ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Now, Father Greely.

FATHER ANDREW GREELY (Panel Member, Commission VIII; National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois): I am not sure exactly what role I am to play here this morning, whether I am here as a sociologist or as a cleric. Usually this role conflict creates quite a bit of problem. When in the role of cleric, and I find myself in front of an audience like this, I have an almost irresistible temptation to try to take up a collection. (Laughter and applause)

So to compromise a little with myself, I will speak first of all as a sociologist, and then as an observer of Catholic colleges. I would make three observations in each category.

Let me make a preliminary sociological observation. First, I note with great interest that you are meeting today at the same time, in the same building with District 50 United Mine Workers of America, and what struck me as being a significant indication of the state of our society is that out in the lobby one really cannot tell the difference. (Laughter and applause) With the classical exception that the Mine Workers are more expensively dressed. (Laughter)

To more serious things, the first thing that struck

me about the report was that on the indicators that were being used, the standard deviations tend to be quite large, which is to say, in the inimical jargon of sociology, that the predictable variables leave much to be explained.

More simply, we realize that a private, non-denominational school is somewhat more likely to permit a wide variety of free discussion than a private denominational school. However, there are many private denominational schools that are much more liberal than many private non-denominational schools.

Or, again we note in the report that colleges, say, in the southern region of the country are less likely to permit open discussion on certain topics than colleges in other parts of the country. But once again, there were some southern colleges, a good many of them, that were considerably more liberal than some northern colleges.

So the facts of this wide standard deviation would suggest that an attempt to really understand the correlates of freedom on campus would have to go far beyond the use of the rather closed categories such as control, and region of the country, and this kind of social and demographic predicators.

It is not to criticize the report for doing what all reports must do in the first place; but it is to suggest that if we wish to understand the climate of freedom on campuses, we must go beyond general categories and focus on the social systems of individual campuses, to try to determine what are the internal phenomena within a system and the external pressures brought to bear from outside the system, that make for freedom.

There are a good number of explanations for why some colleges have more freedom than others that are not brought into the open when we simply talk about who controls the schools and what part of the country they are in. We must, I think, as one of the previous speakers said, focus much more intently on how the decisions are made in individual schools if we are to understand what causes academic freedom of students.

For example, from my own standpoint, I would truly like to know why in some Catholic colleges there is no problem about talking about birth control in undeveloped countries, and why in other colleges there is. I have some hunches as to what some of the differences might be, but these are only hunches and it would be very interesting to know what the factors are.

My second sociological observation is that freedom is rarely absolute in any of the colleges. With only three percent of the Presidents who would not accept any of the

controversial topics discussed at their school, only a small portion of schools were willing to say that all of the controversial speakers could come. This would suggest to me that if we are looking for theoretical models with which to envision academic freedom for students, we would have to think in terms of a continuum, or perhaps a series of continuum, stretching between complete unfreedom and complete freedom, and recognize that what is happening is that different schools have different cutting points on the continuum. The cutting points are generally much more in the direction of freedom than unfreedom, but nevertheless the cutting points are in most instances short of freedom.

Once again, the question that intrigues me as a sociologist is what are the motivations in a decision making process by which the school administration decides what its cutting point should be? Why, for example, a school would be able to accept Malcolm X as a speaker and not Lincoln Rockwell? What are the differences between these two that would put the cutting point between them?

Yes I think if we are interested in a profound, sophisticated understanding of the climate of freedom in schools, this is the question it ought to treat with.

The third question I have steps back a pace from the report and says, to what extent does the student care about the freedom?

I think those of us who work with young people in any capacity are beginning to feel today that the gap between the concerned and the non-concerned is very wide. The committed student, the restless student, the one who pickets and this sort of thing, is very committed and very restless. But the apathetic student is very apathetic and very uninterested. In between there is an ever widening gap.

This is to suggest that the academic freedom of the student might not be so much threatened by tyranny as by apathy, and that if academic freedom vanishes from the campus it will not be so much as a result of oppression as the result of atrophy.

I am not suggesting it is the role of the Dean of Students to stir up enthusiasm for the exercise of academic freedom on the campus, but I would suggest that in any overall study of the climate of academic freedom somebody ought to ask why in the world are so many students so unconcerned about freedom.

This leads me to suggest a strategy which you may or may not want to accept. Suppose that you are having a reasonably controversial speaker coming to your campus, and you suddenly get a terrible feeling that only twenty-five students are going to show up for him. The speaker will be

embarrassed, the school will be embarrassed, you will be embarrassed, and if the press is there, the whole university or college will be embarrassed. To have the speaker banned is one method of handling this. He will of course speak eventually under student pressure before 2,000 people.
(Laughter)

This reminds me of a Dean of a certain college who will remain nameless, who decided he wanted to institute a program of unlimited cuts in his classes in the school so people would not have to come to class at all. His college and faculty said this is absurd, students are not asking for this. It was necessary for the Dean to go out and play the role of agent provocateur and stir up the students to introduce the reforms necessary. (Laughter) I leave it to your Commission to decide whether this is professionally ethical behavior or not.

To turn from my general sociological comments, certain comments were made about Catholic colleges and the findings concerning them. In a sense I am not satisfied. All my professional experience as a sociologist has been at the University of Chicago; however, I shall still comment on the situation. (Laughter)

I am not going to apologize for the somewhat more restricted situations that were reported on the Catholic colleges. I do not intend to apologize for them, not because I don't like them, but I think they are vanishing quite rapidly. Ten years from now I dare say there will be few Catholic colleges in the country that will be afraid to talk about birth control in undeveloped countries. I suppose in the same decade, or so, Malcolm X, if he were still alive, or his successor, and George Lincoln Rockwell will speak at these colleges if invited to speak, before, I assume, a small and apathetic audience.

The reason I suggest these changes will occur is that from my particular viewpoint here on the beach, it seems that the Catholic church is going into two major transitional situations. In this country it is making a transition from being the church of the ethnic immigrant to being the church of the suburban bourgeoisie. Whether this is an improvement or not we will leave for another discussion. (Laughter) In any case, it is a dramatic change and will bring Catholic higher education pretty much into the mainstream of American life. We may even someday -- who knows? -- have a Catholic president of this outfit. (Laughter) Who knows? Even a Jesuit. (Laughter)

The second transitional process, of course, is the adornment of the Catholic church, under the auspices of the Vatican.

It seems to me these two transitions will certainly

lead to very different performance in the Catholic colleges in the next NASPA study of this subject.

However, to get to my second point, there is one aspect of the restriction, the somewhat greater restrictiveness of Catholic colleges, which I personally found quite objectionable, and that is the considerably greater restrictiveness reported by the campus editors of Catholic colleges. I see no reason for this. I do not see what we are afraid of. I think I could wait ten years for George Lincoln Rockwell to be able to speak at a Catholic college, but I, for one, as a private citizen of a church, am not prepared to wait that long before the campus editors of Catholic schools have the same freedom as editors at other schools.

I can understand historically and socially why this is not the case, but I do not like it. This is not to say, of course, that all Catholic editors, or even a majority of them, operate with restrictions. The data indicates that the majority do not. But a very substantial group, 47 percent, do operate under restrictions, and I for one would like to see that drastically changed.

The final comment I would make has to do with a very small sentence somewhere in here in the pages of the report, where the student personnel administrator of Catholic colleges is much more likely to report an increase in restlessness of their schools than the student personnel administrators of other colleges.

Now, since everybody thinks the restlessness is increasing, the fact that it may well be increasing more at Catholic colleges is extremely interesting. There are two explanations, neither one of which can be proven by the data. One is that the restlessness is increasing no more at Catholic colleges than at other schools, but that the administrators have suddenly awakened to it and find something new, and hence are somewhat more surprised by it.

The other explanation, the one to which I am inclined, is that indeed there is more restlessness in the schools, because you cannot have a half-sold revolution, and with the revolution going on in America there is probably going to be more restlessness at these schools than at other schools. If this be true, I would suggest the time has come for student personnel administrators in Catholic colleges to re-examine their life insurance situation. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thanks very much, Father Greely. I hope you will all make a point of saying goodbye to him. (Laughter) The Jersey City chapter of the Jesuit group will be informed about this.

More seriously, I would like to call on Dr. Phillip Monypenny of the University of Illinois and the American Association of University Professors.

DR. PHILLIP MONYPENNY (Panel Member, Commission VIII; AAUP; University of Illinois): Let me say, I take it I am here because I am currently Chairman of the new Committee "S" of the American Association of University Professors, which committee, as I think you people know, is concerned with student academic freedom.

This is a new area of the association. When we started we were not even sure we had in fact a defensible kind of concept. As our discussions moved forward, and as astonishingly we find that parallel discussions have gone forward at organizations like Groton, this is coming to be a meaningful concept. I think perhaps one of the more encouraging things about Mr. Williamson's report this morning was that he spoke of academic freedom of students without flinching or shuddering.

So it does seem to be an idea which has a certain currency and I have a little more ease perhaps about being Chairman of a committee which is attempting to say something about this unorthodox topic.

As a committee, we have obviously been concerned primarily with exhortation, primarily, it seems to me, of what deals in this area of, so to speak, principle making -- essentially with exhortation and not with the collection of information. I must say that I was very much pleased to see that as great a body of data was being assembled under the auspices of Commission VIII as has been, and we will look forward to the final publication of the report.

I have had the benefit of it as it has come off the mimeograph machine, and it is an overwhelming mass of information. But very fortunately we did have John Cowan this morning to sort out some impressions from it.

I think this is an area where you also need information, but I think information can be used in a variety of ways. I think we shall attempt to use it as an association to put as much leverage upon you people as possible in the direction of achieving what we consider to be desirable degrees of freedom.

The factual conclusions of the report, I think, can be seen from more than one standpoint. Father Greely has spoken this morning as a social scientist. In my spare time I am some sort of a social scientist. I teach political science, and it does fall within that rough group of the social sciences. I might put a novel hypothesis forward, namely, the data does not indicate that there are no institutions of higher education in the United States which do not believe in some measure of freedom. What the report says is that people do believe in freedom. There are no people who believe in no freedom. That is, of course, a gratifying conclusion. (Laughter)

But some of the positive conclusions, I think, are really rather alarming. That there are any college presidents in the United States, or any chairmen of committees of any kind in any college who would consider it possibly disadvantageous for Earl Warren to speak on their campuses is something that really makes my hair stand on end. And I have somewhat a similar response to some of these other persons whose status as acceptable speakers was at the bottom.

Malcolm X may have been a very troublesome figure within the Civil Rights movement, but he certainly had a great deal to say that a great many people in this country should have heard. His access to audiences was, after all, rather restricted. He represented a kind of viewpoint about American life that those of us who had any complacency about it should have heard him. We do not have to accept of course; yet this man who speaks out of a very private, intense, bitter experience is regarded as a thoroughly uncomfortable person to have, obviously, on a great many campuses in this country.

So the existence of freedom, as far as this study documents its existence, is something for which we can be, I think, very pleased and somewhat proud.

But I certainly would not want to draw the conclusion that the kinds of hesitations which were expressed at many points in this report, represented a sort of optimum situation for an academic community.

The point that I would note is that virtually all the questions that were asked substantially had to do with freedom of discussion, and when you live in a situation in which freedom of discussion, which would seem to be one of the natural attributes of an academic institution, is something about which any significant number of persons have any reservations, then I think our academic enterprise again is by no means in the utterly healthy state in which we would like to see it.

Let me point up the matter in this way. We tend to think of our universities and our colleges as partially isolated worlds, which they are. We often tend, however, to forget their function in the real world, that is, to be a place where things can be said and debated which other persons less privileged cannot so easily say and debate.

If James Silver can exist at the University of Mississippi and utter his heresies about the life of Mississippi, this is something that is far more healthy for the State of Mississippi. It provides one point at which it is being prepared in the future for a situation which at all too many other points is being closed off and denied.

The fact that things are therefore uncomfortable in the community and they do not like it, does not, it seems

to me to be an adequate reason that our colleges or universities should be careful about what is being said. I think rather the reverse should be said. What really is the significance of Silver of Mississippi is exactly that he is saying things that nobody in Mississippi wants to hear, yet they should hear if, again, the university is not to be merely a piece of the whole structure of maintenance of the past but is what we always claim universities are, a way of preparing for the future.

So I think if you will look over these categories which have been set out which characterize various institutions, they may not be as explanatory as Father Greely wishes they were, they nevertheless do, as a political synthesis, suggest to me certain explanations, namely, you can say anything where you do not offend your particular clientele. But if your particular clientele has particular sensitivities, whether it be southern, Catholic, or fundamentalist, or simply middle class in a rather old-fashioned way, those are the things of course you do not say.

In other words, we are talking about persons being concerned about restrictions on freedom of discussion because they would make some clientele which are important to the institution unhappy.

Well, it is very true that there are many diversities in the United States. Fortunately, the things that cannot be said at Illinois can perhaps be said at Harvard and those things which cannot be said at a small college in Kentucky can be perhaps said at the Princeton Theological Seminary. But despite that diversity, the colleges and university it seems to me do have responsibilities to their clienteles as well as to the general public, and if their clienteles need to hear this thing which they would rather not hear, I do not think the university can get itself off the hook by saying of course our clientele would not stand for that, and therefore someone else will say them, and we do not need to. Which is, I think, one of the ways of excusing ourselves for some of the restrictions on freedom of discussion on some of the campuses.

To that extent I have been very intrigued by the great acceptance of very dramatic and emotional kinds of student activities, such as sit-ins and other kinds of non-violent demonstrations. There is obviously a large measure of tolerance of these on the American campuses.

But look at the people who are doing these things. They come from the better families of the small towns of Illinois, in a report on my own section. They come from the better families from Oak Park, to stay in my own section. It is the great upper middle class which is being involved in this tremendous movement for the restoration of the dignity of man, and to say to a college and university situation, "We will permit the upper crust to do what they will do," is not to

say anything very bold or very striking. It is only to confirm a very interesting and I think thoroughly heartwarming-- that is an awfully banal expression, but I use it for lack of one better -- thoroughly reinforcing of some of these prejudices that in American life you do have the capacity of the more privileged and the underprivileged to speak out and work for the dignity of man, shall I say. The middle groups in between do not necessarily get well taken care of in a situation, but at least we can go down a couple of rungs and do something about the people at the bottom. We are justifying the American society.

This is the heart of the thing about society. But I do not know that the University of Illinois, again, can be very smug because it lets the children of the Board of Trustees go off to Alabama, Mississippi and Washington, and other places, and make thorough-going nuisances of themselves. These are after all, figuratively speaking at least, children of the Board of Trustees and this is not, after all, such a really radical kind of revolt against the existing society. It is a revolt against certain conditions which exist in a particular segment of society, a condition deplored by the rest of society, to an extent.

So I do regard the report as a splendid body of information. I am pleased that it reveals as much as it does reveal about the existence of areas of freedom on American campuses. But I do not regard those areas in which freedom does not seem to exist in quite the way a libertarian as myself would like to see it. I do not regard those areas as something that needs to be excused, particularly when one reflects upon the circumstances under which there are areas of denial.

I do not want to take up too much time. There are really many points in this whole discussion which ought to be covered, and I will cut some of the topics I have selected.

Let me note some of the omissions of this report, because after all this is a report, as you said, which deals fundamentally with areas of freedom of discussion.

Those of us on Committee "S" seem to be concerned about some other areas which seem to be quite troublesome and they may go back to the question of apathy on campus. I sometimes wonder whether it is not in fact socially determined or campus determined. In other words, despite the fact that we do have an activist group on all our campuses which is able to take unconventional positions and extreme positions without apparently an intolerable measure of personal risk, people perceive risk differently, and I wonder what some of the perceptual risk is with regard to and in the eyes of some of our students.

We people in this room, as teachers and administra-

tors, do control access to all of the more desirable occupations and statuses in American life. We are keeping records on students with greater intensity than ever kept before. We exchange records with each other when asked for opinions on people who have been in other places. The result is that any unconventional person knows, if he has any sophistication, that there are various ways in which he is being judged and recorded without knowing in any way what is done with those judgments and those records.

As counselors I am sure that all of you people are called upon to provide, as I am occasionally, opinions about people or applicants for all kinds of jobs, positions and opportunities for further education. What shall we respond to some of these inquiries that come to us? What shall we do about the information we have about these students which we pick up in these large contacts that the contemporary campuses present? We have a paradox that on the one hand people do protest about numbers. On the other hand the nice adulation from the faculty which students enjoyed in my day is disappearing.

You cannot get into the university without seeing your adviser. I got through college without the benefit of his ministrations. But I do spend time with my own academic advisers and I am in a position to report on their characters and dispositions in a way none of my professors were in a position to report upon me.

We are in a position in which we can very well have an overt atmosphere of freedom and a sort of silent atmosphere of close inspection and conformity and penalize in various ways the person whose conduct is not in conformance, whether it be nonconformance in a sexual sense, or political sense, or what have you.

I think that this is an area in which you people are going to have to perhaps pursue a study of this kind to get the basic data on which the present body of college practices can be viewed.

I have taken more time than I intended to. May I conclude by saying that I do enormously appreciate in the report the concern with the general character of the educational institution, the concern with the general character of the enterprise, and the general definition of it I should not quarrel with; but I think we should look beyond a rather formal area, political action, etc., to many of the informal areas of campus life to know what kind of education we are in fact providing, because it just seems to me more and more that we have become a super paternalistic, maternalistic kind of enterprise which guides people in much more specific ways and by much more rigidly defined criteria than academic institutions originally have. This is part of our concern for students, but concern can be as stifling as

indifference, more stifling perhaps. So I do think that there are some open areas which do need to be looked at in addition to these areas that have been covered. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you, Dr. Monypenny.

Now Mr. Stephen Robbins, President of the United States National Student Association

MR. STEPHEN J. M. ROBBINS (Panel Member, Commission VIII; USNSA; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania): Dr. Money-penny indicated that he thought he had been brought to participate as a reactor here this morning because he was Chairman of Committee "S" of the AAUP. I suppose I am here because Dean Williamson has written that NSA has triggered the revolution.

I do not know whether this is appropriate, but perhaps because NSA has an active international involvement we become very concerned with questions of protocol, and ever since I sat down here I have been wondering why Dr. Money-penny and I are to the left and the other three individuals are to the right. (Laughter)

At any rate, I will second a great deal of what Dr. Money-penny has said. I think the report is a significant step forward because it represents a formal interest on behalf of this organization in the area of student academic freedom. The report could have been done by any research institute or anybody, I suppose, but the fact that it was done by NASPA I think is the most significant aspect of the whole report.

I think it is the concern of Deans to analyze and question the prevalence of student academic freedom on their campuses and on campuses in general in this country. I certainly hope they do have a commitment to defend student interests in administration squabbles or conflicts of interest that develop from time to time over questions such as those discussed in this report.

I would like to make only one challenge to the data itself, that is the way in which the responses on unqualified restrictions of student academic freedom were, percentagewise, established. The Presidents, as you know from reading the report, were asked to comment on a sentence, the sentence being: "It has been suggested that an essential part of the education of each student is the freedom to hear, critically examine, and express viewpoints on a range of positions held and advocated regarding issues that divide our society. Would you comment on the relevancy of the above statement to the educational philosophy of your institution?"

The report indicates that over 70 percent of the

Presidents responding, and a very similar percentage of other responses to the questionnaire, felt they could make an unqualified version of this statement. Yet all of the data on specific situations involves a much smaller significant percentage of people who would permit certain things to occur on their campus. Fred Schwarz, for example, could speak only at 53 percent of the campuses without qualification, and yet we have 70 percent that say they could listen to Fred Schwarz.

If I go through the list of that middle group of speakers to which Mr. Cowan referred this morning, the highest single percentage is Mr. George Wallace who received 66, and there are varying degrees down to 50 percent, and those are not the most controversial speakers, the most controversial being the Malcolm X's or fascists.

I think that one might look at the unqualified version of that statement with a slight bit of skepticism, and this is not to imply that people do not have a commitment to that principle, but in practice I think one of the most honest responses of the Presidents is, "This institution believes in this principle, but it is difficult to apply." That is at least the type of response I can respect, because I think it is difficult to apply, and I think students have a greater recognition of some of the other priorities and pressures that exist on administrators than a good many administrators will give them credit for.

I would like to address most of my remarks to the editorial comments on this report which you received in your registration packets. The data is significant, and I think it speaks for itself. Dean Williamson and the other writers and authors of this report have, however, added a great deal of comment of an interpretive nature to the general question of student academic freedom, and it is to this area that I would like to speak.

The most significant thing about it, I think is the evolutionary approach and the implicit concept, as all of the reactors this morning have indicated, that we are moving in the direction of greater academic freedom. Very few people, except on a hypothetical basis, talk seriously about declining student academic freedom. This is, I think, the most valuable aspect of the report from an editorial point of view.

I was particularly impressed with the final portions of the report which discussed possible solutions, or means to establish greater student academic freedom on campuses, particularly in various seminars and discussions with student leaders and activists, to discuss their concerns for the campus, to discuss what their objections to existing practices were, and to attempt to come to some sort of peaceful resolution of whatever conflicts may exist.

My organization certainly does not endorse the demonstration type approach to satisfying student demands or needs. However, I would like to point out that I think this in itself is a reflection of the degree to which those elements of the campus are alienated from the administrations. If they do not use the channels, it is because in their opinion the channels are not open.

I have heard a great deal of smiling comment and smirking comment about the University of California. As a University of California alumnus, it is my belief that that is one of the freest campuses, and was even before October one of the freest campuses in this country. So it demonstrates to me the fact that greater freedom does not necessarily result in greater complacency with existing levels of freedom.

I would be very concerned that anyone would be satisfied with an existing level of freedom on the assumption that we will have no problems with students at this campus. And the restrictions at Berkeley were minimal compared to the restrictions which exist on campuses, if this report is to be considered reliable.

Almost every single question that was asked in that report, Clark Kerr or Franklin Murphy, or any of the administrators at Berkeley would have answered favorably, "can speak," "can discuss," etc. They were in that three percent of perfect campuses to which many of the reactors would refer.

Yet the fact of the matter is that the people who engaged in the demonstrations at Berkeley were people who were completely alienated, at least in my view, from the administration and from student government channels, and thus they did not turn to those channels to discuss their grievances. Furthermore those channels have for the last five years peacefully petitioned the University for a change in the regulations. I am unaware as to exactly what consideration was given at the upper echelons as opposed to the lower echelons of the administration to those requests, but certainly channels have been used, so I do not think that we can be perfectly happy with the seminar approach. But I think it would be a significant development.

What is most important is that when we use the seminar approach, that we actually hold them not to keep the students quiet, but to listen to what their demands are.

My real concern in this country is not the level of freedom so much as what I consider the level of hypocrisy. I am concerned that administrators will not be perfectly frank with me in telling me what problems there are, the kinds of pressures and priorities they face, and why they are unable to grant students greater freedom. They have a couple of approaches. One is -- and I am not trying to

generalize here. I think there are many, many exceptions to this, but I am talking about those cases where people are upset. One approach is to talk about the mission of the institution and the incompatibility of a given request with the mission of the institution. Yet on, say, the same day that a refusal is given to a controversial speaker to appear on campus, on the grounds that such a speech would not be compatible with the educational and sophisticated analytical framework of an institution of higher education, the Beatles can come on the campus and perform a concert without any objection whatsoever from the institution.

Now I question whether the mission argument is really a serious one and whether or not in fact the real question is what would be a variety of different pressures that would be exerted on the administration if this occurs.

To me, the real misfortune at Berkeley is yet to be seen. We have no idea of what the public of the State of California is going to do to the University of California as a result of what they have seen during the last three months. We have no way of knowing what the legislature is going to do in terms of funding and other very important aspects of running a university. This would be the price the university would pay.

I think if students were approached on this level frankly, they might be much more amenable to compromising and recognizing it, because students do have a commitment to the total university. They are not just interested in their selfish interest. They do recognize that buildings and funds and so forth are important parts of their education and a prerequisite to them.

So I think if we attempt to approach students as we would like them to act, they will in turn act mature. That means we must listen to their comments. We must attempt to give some sympathy for them and respect for their participation.

In another point in Dean Williamson's report it was indicated that the study revealed that Presidents of institutions felt that participation by students in the government of the institution was most beneficial in terms of the Presidents' reaction to that participation, in cases where it was genuinely significant in terms of its impact on the governments of the institution, that is to say, where students exercised some sort of real power.

I do not mean to imply -- I am not a Latin-Americanist and think that students should run institutions. But the point is, when they have a real vote, even though it is only one of ten, and they are listened to and treated as though their opinions were worthwhile, then they will participate significantly and in turn their comments will be of

value to the administration. But when they are herded off into a little study committee which reports to the deputy assistant to the Dean of Housing, or something, they are not going to significantly contribute and their comments will probably not be of great value.

Students are very sharp. They see through it. If one questions why there is not broader participation in student government in this country today, one might well question what, exactly, student governments do and whether what they do is really relevant to the vast majority of students on the campuses in this country.

Certainly the most significant thing is this localism question. One of the topics least satisfactory in terms of discussion and least likely to be permitted was the question of local fair housing laws.

I am sure on the same campus where you could discuss the Civil Rights Act or the federal registration act, which after all applies down there, to those six states, you could not discuss (that is what the study reveals) a local fair housing act.

This again is what I call the hypocrisy of the general appeal to the students. It is not so much a question of this issue being on campus. It is a question that is off campus, but not outside the perimeter of fifty miles. International issues can be discussed, but not national issues with a greater frequency, with the exception of birth control information.

So I think one might question the whole approach, you see, of Deans and administrators to their students in discussing this question. I think if they laid facts out on the table to students and discussed the problems of funding, the problems of public reaction, the problems of developing relations with the community, and the essential relevance these relations have in terms of finding funds and carrying on the activities of the institution, the students would be much more amenable to compromise and not push, in what is essentially sort of a paranoid reaction.

The Deans are very sensitive about student attitudes toward Deans. The study reveals, for example, that editors feel they are oppressed, at least in a significant percentage of cases. But I wonder if this does not work the other way as well. I wonder how many Deans, for example, feel that students are basically out to destroy the institution. In the study sections you were given, there is a section entitled "Freedom Students Desire." I would maintain that the first three freedoms that students supposedly desire that are listed here are in fact misinterpretations of students' desires for freedom. Most significantly, "they want to choose the most controversial issue they can possibly think of."

Now in my experience in student government and with students in this country, I found that where speakers programs exist that are run particularly by the student governments, the issues brought to the campus are of a wide variety and reflect the same number of issues by the society. It is the Gus Halls and Oswald Mosleys that come to the attention of the administration. But if we look at these in terms of numbers, the vast majority of speakers students bring to the campus are of an "acceptable" nature.

Students do not want to bring just controversial speakers to the campus. They want to bring a variety of speakers, some of which may eventually become controversial.

"The next freedom is the freedom to editorialize, and of course this means the freedom to attack the administration. Who else? This is the enemy, the bad guys."

This is simply in my opinion not the case. Students do not desire to attack the administration. They probably have a variety of problems, and it is inevitable there will be some conflicts between the students and the administration. At that point they attack the administration. Therefore the administration becomes very sensitive. If the students attack the faculty, then the administration does not really react to it quite as strongly. If the students attack student apathy, which they frequently do, the administration does not react to it.

I think I would find that students find other objects to attack with greater frequency than they attack the administration, if I were to do a study for a daily paper on the campus.

It seems to me this reflects a tremendous gap that exists between students and administrators in this country. First they are not communicating their needs to administrators. Secondly the students and administrators have warped conceptions of each other.

I think administrators, as these two statements reveal in a report which very largely is apropos academic freedom, tend to conceptualize students as being very basically adolescent and immature. When you talk their problems over with them, I think you will find they will be a good deal more responsible.

So I would urge you, as an organization, not only to study these questions and collect data -- I think that is significant -- but more importantly to participate in the evolution, the peaceful revolution that Dean Williamson refers to; to certainly improve the desirable diversity of student academic freedom that exists, but make it a little more diverse in favor of freedom. I think this is the significant role this organization can play, and I think that

if they approach students and student organizations, they will find that these people are as interested in sitting down and discussing a question responsibly as you are. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you very much, Stephen.

We have reached a time period where other things press upon us. I wonder if you would feel too frustrated to wait until eight-thirty for your discussion, with Commission VIII, Panel of reactors and the associate -- for those who will be able to be here.

I want to thank the Commission and the panel of reactors for being here.

This meeting stands adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at eleven-fifty o'clock ...

LUNCHEON - SMALL COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

Monday - April 5, 1965

The Luncheon session for Small College Representatives convened in the Delaware Suite at one o'clock, Dean David L. Harris, Dean of Men, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin, presiding.

CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Tom Emmet has an announcement or two that he would like to make.

... Conference announcements ...

CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. Welcome to the annual NASPA luncheon for the representatives of small colleges.

The presence of people today from such state institutions as Indiana and Washington seems somewhat less than moot testimony of the fact that the term "small college" is more one of a state of mind perhaps than a fact. (Laughter) Perhaps this means that you are with us ideologically, or on the other hand perhaps it is a bit of a regression. Maybe you would like to go back to the small, happy days.

If you will forgive me for saying so, I think some of you are like our 55-pound German Shepherd dog at home. She persists in the idea that she is a small dog, and she tries regularly to concept this idea of self by crawling up into people's laps. (Laughter)

These small college luncheons have always had their very amusing aspects. Last year some of you will remember that we had as our speaker the head of California's newest institution of higher learning, an institution that was expected within four or five years, if my memory serves me correctly, to reach an enrollment in excess of 10,000. Of course, it is true that at the time of his speaking to us last year the enrollment had absolutely zero students. It had not yet gotten its student body, so perhaps this qualified him to speak to a group such as this. After all, it seems to me you cannot get much smaller and still survive. (Laughter)

Our speaker today however represents the real thing. He represents an institution that is truly small, numerically, although a giant academically.

Dr. Hugh Borton, President of Haverford College, received his Bachelor's degree from that institution and his Master's from Columbia. He then went to Holland to take his Doctor of Philosophy work. Even before completing his Master's degree he had begun his close association with Japan and the Far East by living and working in Tokyo.

Subsequently he lectured and taught the Japanese language and history at Columbia, and during the war years and for a few years thereafter he was associated with the State Department as a specialist on Japan, working closely with General MacArthur and being deeply involved with the framing of the Japanese constitution.

He then returned to his work at Columbia in 1948, and he remained in that association until assuming the Presidency of Haverford in 1957.

That all of President Borton's attention has not been devoted to these far-off fields of Japan and college presidencies is attested to by his relationship to NASPA itself.

As you know, he is one of the two college presidents serving as members of Dean Williamson's Commission VIII and so he is no stranger to our Association, nor to our present concerns and issues.

Dr. Borton's presence on the educational scene and at our luncheon today is stunning testimony, I think, that smallness in an institution is no bar to greatness, and that the brilliance of a man's life and influence can never be bounded by campus acreage nor limitation of student enrollments.

Writing a few years ago in a Haverford publication President Borton said: "The shadows lengthen, the hours of daylight shorten, and the midnight oil burns," which makes me think he understands our work. (Laughter) He also went on to say, perhaps in a prophetic vein looking forward to some of the issues that face us today, "This year all signs indicate that the changes of spring will burst upon us faster than ever."

Ladies and Gentlemen, our speaker, Dr. Hugh Borton.
(Applause)

DR. HUGH BORTON (President, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania): Thank you very much, Dean Harris.

To carry on the incongruity of the people who speak to you, according to Dean Harris, at this luncheon for small colleges, some of you may have noticed in a fairly recent issue of Newsweek that those of us in administration at Haverford have been described by the current president of the students' association as "having botched things up," by either being too paternalistic, or not caring what happened to students. (Laughter)

You will also notice that I decided it would be well to be extra fortified by having my own Dean of Students sit next to me and tell me what I should say to you. If you

have questions afterwards, maybe Jim Lyons can answer them better than I can.

Your Association is to be congratulated for its foresight in having begun to organize four years ago through its Commission of Students and Social Issues a study of the actual facts and conditions on the campuses of a thousand of our colleges and universities concerning students and academic freedom.

The findings of the study of Commission VIII -- and I can speak here without any pride of authorship, because I came into membership in the Commission late, so I do not consider it my work, but the work of others on the Commission -- this study is going to be of aid to us all in trying to solve one of the most difficult current campus problems.

I am reminded of one of the chapters in Lincoln Steffens' autobiography which he entitled, "I Created a Crime Wave." The point he was making was that by concentrating on crime in his reporting and bringing it to the attention of the reading public, people assumed that there had been a sudden rise in the crime rate when such was not actually the case.

At a meeting at Princeton a few weeks ago of the Public Information Officers of Colleges and Universities, members of the mass media informed those at the conference that currently the most newsworthy material on problems of higher education were student riots or protests. This view is borne out by the material on our colleges and universities currently appearing in the daily press.

Unfortunately for the Student Personnel Administrator, we cannot dismiss present day campus unrest on the grounds that it is receiving more publicity than heretofore. We have to face the fact that it exists and will increase in the future. As many of you know, the United States Student Press Association lists significant student unrest in the immediate past at the University of California at Berkeley, Yale, St. John's University and Brooklyn College in New York, the University of Kansas, New Mexico State University, Florida State University, Wake Forest College, Trinity College, and on several Oregon campuses.

In fact, when the Chairman this morning announced that there was an emergency call, I sensed a tenseness on the part of everyone in the room. (Laughter) And my conclusion from this sudden tenseness on the part of all of us is that unlike the psychiatrists -- I understand at their national conventions when they greet each other they say, "You're all right; how am I?" (Laughter) -- your greeting as you convened yesterday and today probably was, "Well, things were quiet when I left. It was vacation. How are they on your campus?" (Laughter)

On March 28th, 1965 -- during vacation, incidentally -- a group of about 200 students from twenty-nine Eastern Colleges met in Philadelphia to approve of a "manifesto" on greater rights for students.

The draft version of the document discussed at this meeting (in case you have not seen reports of it), is reported in the press to read in part as follows:

"Students and more deplorably, faculty have forsaken leadership of the academic community. In their places, professional academic administrators responsible to an external board of visitors and regents have developed; they have found ingenious theories to suppress student maturity and thoughtful action. They have built the university on the material corpus of industry, defense and corporate wealth; they have replaced the intellectual climate with the social slumber of 'preparation for citizenship'; they have renounced the conflict of ideas and have provided instant cumbersome channels for inhibiting communications; they have reduced students to an exploited body and the faculty to a production line."

At this same meeting, ways and means of forming a national coordinating committee to channel campus protest movements were discussed, but the news article went on to say, "No agreement could be reached on how to bring this about."

Well now, college deans and other administrators, including college presidents, can, and doubtless will react to this sort of meeting and these statements in various ways. Some of us will dismiss them as unimportant because they come from a small minority group, and thus are not typical of the great mass of today's undergraduates.

Others of us will become angered by them and retort with blasts about student naivete and irresponsibility.

On the other hand, if we control our emotions, college administrators can come to realize that there is a much more basic problem involved in student unrest than a conflict of a small minority of committed students against what they believe to be apathetic, benign and uncommitted administration.

As I see the problem of student freedom, and I have been closely involved in one aspect of it, the basic challenge facing our colleges and universities is how to preserve the difficult balance between freedom with responsibility on the one hand, and to use those controls which are necessary on the other to allow an institution of higher learning to carry on its basic function of educating its students. The importance of the difficulties of President Clark Kerr and

Chancellor Martin Meyerson at Berkeley have arisen over the fact that certain student elements, in what appears to be in the name of student academic freedom, have threatened freedom with responsibility by believing that the constant use or threat of use of either active or passive force can achieve their objectives of eliminating reasonable controls.

In reality, if the extremists among the students were to win, the conservative elements in the Regents would then take over and the University of California would undoubtedly lose much of the academic freedom for which President Kerr has been fighting both for the faculty and the students. The same pattern would follow on all of our campuses. It is for this reason and because of this threat to real academic freedom on our campuses that I have chosen to confine my remarks to the problems of academic freedom created by this group of vocal, committed students.

As anyone who has been connected with a college or university over the past thirty years is fully aware, the committed student is nothing new on our campus. His intensity, extent and degree of commitment to problems close at hand, both on and off the campus, is new. Furthermore, and this is obvious to you, this is an age of demonstrations and protests in which personal involvement is a distinctive mark. Protests of all sorts, against segregation, Vietnam, failure to grant tenure to specific faculty members, higher tuition costs -- reading of poetry, I think it was, out at Oregon, and at St. John's claiming, as Jim Lyons pointed out to me during lunch, claiming that calling the President of St. John's "Father" smacked of paternalism. (Laughter)

All of these causes are championed by the able, highly individualistic, self-centered committed student. In many cases they are motivated by the highest possible ideals. On the other hand, many of the causes they support appear to be full of inconsistencies. For example, they insist on greater freedom from interference by the administration in all aspects of college life, and at the same time insist that there be developed closer contacts between the students on the one hand and the faculty and administration on the other.

As already pointed out, they believe that the faculty and students together should make the basic decisions on policies for the colleges and universities, implying that administrators are a necessary evil and trustees serve no other purpose than to be obstructionist. They wish for greater individual instruction and advocate higher faculty salaries and more faculty appointments without realizing that to do all these things requires vastly increased financial resources, including higher tuition charges, to which they object.

But we will be making the worse possible mistake for the future of academic freedom on our campuses if we

were to blind ourselves to the legitimate appeals of students for improved conditions in undergraduate education simply because we see inconsistencies in their positions.

Because of the pressure of increased numbers of students, the individual, particularly on the large campus, feels that he is ignored as a person and that education has become mechanized and he has become an automaton. Archibald MacLeish states that our universities are training their students for American life and the nation's needs. He notes that as the state requires its citizens to sign disclaimer affidavits and prohibits them from travel to certain countries they are becoming social machines and victims of the state. If our chief duty at the colleges is to turn out people with specialized skills which the nation needs to work for it, the objections to the system by our students are well founded. As President Lawrence Gould expressed it while still at Carleton College, "Our civilization will die when we no longer care, when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men." Is this what the committed student is trying to tell us? I believe it is.

Another theme which appears to run through all of the various forms of student unrest on our campuses is for better communications between administrators. This lack of communication is nothing new to any of us. President Kerr, when writing of the "multiversity" and the new problems which it creates, constantly refers to the necessity to set up the means for such communication. Even in the small colleges, where we take pride in assuming that this is not likely to be a problem, we must not take it for granted that a smaller student body automatically results in better relationships between students and administrators. If the machinery does not exist for the regular and uninhibited exchange of ideas between the two groups, it must be created and efforts must be made to see that it works. Is this another one of the things the committed students are trying to say to us? I believe it is.

I might say parenthetically, you remember the comments that were made this morning about the University of California, and the conclusion that obviously the students did not have confidence in such means of communication as had been set up. This is probably all true.

On the other hand, as was whispered in my ear during the session this morning, when there was a sit-in at City College, President Gallagher went right out into the anteroom and sat with the students and said, "Well now, what's on your mind? Let's discuss it." And they said, "No, we don't have anything to say. We want an issue." (Laughter)

I am afraid that there is a great deal of truth

in the minds of some of the demonstrators that this is what they want. They want to create an issue. They really do not want to communicate. So even with the best intention in the world, and with the best machinery in the world, we are not automatically going to solve our problems.

But I would remind you that President Gallagher, after he had made this move and had offered to talk to the students, immediately put himself, of course, in a much stronger position, vis-a-vis all of the other groups and the vast majority of students, by having done this very thing, offering to talk with them and talk directly.

Is not this, then, this breakdown or lack of communication between students and administration, another one of the things that the committed students are trying to say to us? I believe it is.

Consequently, we must not only have the means but the patience to listen to students' appeals for action. What is even more important, if a student appeal for direct action is motivated by high moral principles and is for a worthy cause, deans of students on our campuses should be able to turn it into a significant educational experience for the students involved -- not only for the students involved, but for the institution as a whole.

If you will excuse me, I should like to cite an example which occurred at Haverford two years ago which illustrates what I mean. One of our African students, who was also one of our most popular students, returned to the campus one day to report that a local barber shop had refused to cut his hair. A large group of the student body were outraged at this insult to one of their colleagues. A special committee was immediately formed to protest this action.

Then you will be interested, some of you probably know that we still live in the archaic middle ages and require our students to attend a certain number of religious services a semester, and at Haverford, as you would perhaps expect, it is an unprogrammed Quaker meeting. Well, if it is an unprogrammed Quaker meeting, if somebody feels that they want to speak, they can speak, whether they are a student, or administrator or faculty. And this was made the subject of a talk, with a moral slant, I must say. So a special committee was immediately formed to protest the action.

At this point, they received a sympathetic hearing by the Dean of Students who advised them to consult the local police to see what ordinances existed concerning picketing, to become familiar with the state laws on anti-discrimination in cases of this sort, how the human relations commission functioned, and what specific information or facts were necessary before a complaint could be made to the Commission, and so on.

All these and other steps were followed, including personal visits by individual students with local barbers asking them if they would cut the hair of colored persons. If the answers they received were positive, they were not picketed, and that was the end of it. If the answer was negative, the students then sent a delegation to that barber as a test case. And the campaign finally died a natural death, as somebody said, when the student ran out of haircuts and ran out of colored boys to have their hair cut. (Laughter)

Well, of course, the college -- and by college I refer to myself personally -- received some unfavorable reaction to this campaign from some of the local residents who wondered why we were stirring up an otherwise serene community. But the whole thing really was of very important educational value for everyone.

College administrators and faculty members must listen attentively to issues or recommendations made by students when they fall within an area in which the student is in a position to speak with authority. On some things we recognize and realize that they really do not know whereof they speak. On others, they do.

If students are objecting, for example, to the lack of experience and training of their teachers, the lack of contact with the best faculty because of the latter's concentration on research or frequent leaves of absence, and these conditions do in fact exist on our campuses, then we must bend every effort to improve these conditions. We should not wait to do anything about them until after the students launch a protest against them.

Finally, our colleges should be willing to take a stand on behalf of academic freedom for our faculty members or our students when these are threatened by outside forces which are inimical to the basic concept of an academic community as a place where ideas are tried and tested and which is autonomous because of the faith our society has in those individuals who pursue scholarship and who are entrusted with the education of our young people -- and that includes everyone in this room.

Such a stand was finally taken by the University of California, under the persistent prodding of Clark Kerr who was then a member of the faculty, on behalf of members of the faculty who refused to sign the disclaimer affidavit which the state legislature had demanded of members of the faculty.

The same was true of those colleges and universities which protested the original disclaimer affidavit provision of the National Defense Education Act and which resulted in Senator John F. Kennedy successfully sponsoring

an amendment to this law.

In reference to a stand on a moral issue or a stand on behalf of academic freedom, again I hope you will excuse me if I again refer to my own institution, but having gone through this, along with Jim Lyons, perhaps this experience will be helpful to you, so I will give a brief description of the experience we have had at Haverford College during the past year which we believed called for the College taking an outspoken and unequivocal position on a threat to the freedom of expression on the part of one of our students. Many of you may be familiar with some aspects of the case but others may have seen only garbled accounts of the matter.

One of our students, Russell D. Stetler, Jr., a sophomore at the time, after careful study and thoughtful deliberation, became convinced that our policy in Vietnam was wrong. In order to seek publicity for his point of view, he and two other students formed a Committee on Medical Aid to Viet Cong and prepared a statement setting forth their views as to why they opposed American policy in Vietnam. The statement added that the signers personally were going to donate money for medical supplies for the "Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam." Their statement also contained a college postbox address.

The Chinese Communist news agency in London publicized this statement and rewrote it for its own purposes. This statement was published in the American press. As Stetler was holder of a Philadelphia Board of Education scholarship, the local veterans organizations and individual members of the Board of Education demanded that his scholarship should be rescinded. The Board announced a public meeting on the matter.

The basic issue in this case, as the College saw it, was that the exercise of a person's rights as a citizen to speak or write freely on any subject, or to act in accordance with law and his conscience, should not be regarded as a proper basis for withdrawing a scholarship from a student. Such being the case, the Board of Managers (Trustees) of the College were asked whether they approved of the President of the College appearing at the School Board's special committee meeting and speaking out in favor of freedom of speech and the right to dissent.

In the meantime, Dean Lyons had been active in advising Stetler on his legal rights, suggesting that any medical supplies his group might wish to send should go through legal channels if they were to reach their destination and that he had made a mistake in not making clear the fact that he was not speaking for the College or the student body in his policy statement.

Incidentally, the school paper had already pointed

this out editorially, that he should not have had the college involved in it at all, and he received a good deal of criticism from his fellow students.

At a special meeting of the Board of Managers of the college, unanimous approval was given to the recommendation that the President of the College should appear at the public hearing and present to the Committee a statement based on the principle of the right of freedom of expression and thought. The statement which I read at that meeting, and which has formed the basis for an official college position on freedom of speech contained the following:

The College reaffirms the freedom of assembly as an essential part of the process of discussion, inquiry, and advocacy. Students, therefore, have the right to found new, or to join existing organizations, on or off campus, which advocate and engage in lawful actions to implement their announced goals.

Student actions such as those here involved do not imply approval, disapproval, or sponsorship by the College or its student body; neither do such actions in any way absolve a student from his academic responsibilities. Similarly, students are expected to make clear that they are speaking or acting as individuals and not for the College or its student body.

The freedom to learn, to inquire, to speak, to organize and to act with conviction within the bounds of law, are held by Haverford College to be a cornerstone of education in a free society.

In concluding my remarks before the special Committee I pointed out that Stetler's academic achievement exceeded the required levels, that he had a good conduct record, and that if there was a basis for belief of a law having been broken, the matter should be determined by the proper legal authorities, and not by an outside board of education or any other educational body. I might say that I was given a very rough time by the Chairman of this special Committee.

By coincidence, the annual meeting of the College's Alumni Association was held the day after the hearing by the Board of Education's Committee. I was asked to describe the treatment I had received by the special Committee, which was far from friendly, and much to my gratification the Alumni Association members present voted almost unanimously to endorse the action taken by the College in this matter. This of course strengthened my hand tremendously when we got further publicity on the policy and on my appearance at the Committee from some irate alumnus in Washington, for instance. I could say, "It's just too bad you weren't at

Alumni Day yesterday; you could have objected; but as it turned out, all of your fellow alumni approved." (Laughter)

In July, 1964, the Special Committee of the Board of Education did not recommend rescinding the scholarship. In all truthfulness, I must say that it was not because of the effectiveness of my presentation or position of the Board, but because there was very real -- at least one of the factors was that there was a very real legal question as to whether they actually had the right to rescind it, because the only requirements were that the college affirm, as I did, as I indicated here earlier, that the college affirm that he was in good standing and that we could give him a good conduct record.

Now, some institutions might say, "Well, if he had gotten the college involved in this way, how could you give him a good conduct record?" My only answer to that is we thought this was a matter of principle and that this did not, therefore, convince us that it was misconduct.

As many of you can realize, this whole question took an interminable amount of time of several individuals. Everyone is by no means satisfied with the position we took. But our position was based on a moral principle and no one can deny that on this basis we had a right to take the stand that we did. The committed students also had this evidence that at least on this issue the College likewise was committed. Parenthetically, one of the biggest thrills of this whole process was as I left the hearing room several of our students went to the hearing and they were not the beatnik type at all, and as I left the hearing room one of the students who later was selected as a Rhodes scholar, turned to me and said, "Well, I am proud to go to a college which takes the stand that it did."

Another aftermath and effect of this whole thing has been that it resulted in producing an official statement for the College on the question of academic freedom for students. Merely having such a statement does not eliminate all of the problems. At times it seems to aggravate them. But those of us who were involved in this issue at least have the satisfaction which comes from standing up for something when we believe it to be right. If our colleges and universities, including my own, will continue to do so when the challenge comes I firmly believe we will have largely solved the current problem of campus unrest created by the committed students.

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN HARRIS: Thank you very much, President Borton.

We have been told that copies of President Borton's

paper will be available in the press room, should any of you wish to get copies. It occurs to me that maybe many of us would like to have in our own possession the statement which President Borton referred to.

I think we have time for any of you to take up this challenge and ask questions of him, or of Dean Lyons for that matter. Any questions or comments you would like to make? If not, I know that we have some seminars coming up in about fifteen minutes. Perhaps you would like to prepare for those.

Thank you very much.

... The Luncheon Session adjourned at one forty-five o'clock ...

SEMINAR
Concepts of Freedom
Monday - April 5, 1965

CHAIRMAN PETER H. ARMACOST (Dean of Students, Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota): Dean Roberts asked me to announce once again, before we get to the purpose of our gathering, that your receipts must be signed. He has added one inducement. He says that unless your receipt has been initialed, you will not be placed on the roster, which may have some disadvantages, the chief one being that the Proceedings will not be mailed to you since you will not be an official attendant at the Conference. Therefore, he suggests again that you check your receipt and make sure it is initialed, and if not, go to the registration desk sometime this afternoon.

You will note that on the program our gathering this afternoon is listed as a seminar dealing with "Concepts of Freedom." Our faculty members and you would protest the notion that we can conduct a seminar with this large a gathering, in this sized room. However, the title does suggest our format in that our speaker will give a relatively short presentation and rely then on the group, through your questions and comments, to direct the discussion in areas appropriate to your need.

Furthermore, the literature on teaching methods suggests that when you have a very exciting leader, size may be mitigated as a variable, and indeed we have that today.

In thinking of an appropriate introduction, it occurred to me, in a somewhat devilish moment, perhaps all I needed to do was say that our speaker today is a college

president. Follow that with a long, projective pause, during which you could insert the adjectives which you deemed appropriate.

Wishing, however, to create the optimal situation for our speaker, and knowing somewhat of his excellent contributions to higher education and to society, let me proceed in a more orthodox fashion.

The speaker today is Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, the President of Brooklyn College.

Dr. Gideonse was educated at Columbia College and University, and did subsequent graduate work at the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He has progressed through the ranks, from lecturer to full professor, and Chairman of Economics at Columbia and Bernard Colleges, Rutgers University, and the University of Chicago; and on two different occasions has served as guest professor at the Free University of Berlin.

Those of you who are familiar with the literature in the field of economics will recognize our speaker today as one who has made substantive contributions to his field in the form of publication of five books, and joint authorship of two more, and numerous articles on a variety of topics.

He has also contributed to higher education and our national concern in a variety of forms, just a few of which include being a member of the steering committee on the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, member of the National Commission on Education, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation; member of the Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council on Education.

Dr. Gideonse has been widely recognized and honored for his contributions, having been awarded a number of honorary degrees, and being personally cited by the King of Denmark, by the government of the Netherlands, and of France.

More recently in his home territory he has been the recipient of the 1961 Bill of Rights award for distinguished public service in the field of education, recipient of the 1964 Man of the Year award from the Metropolitan Council of B'nai B'rith.

Many of you are quite familiar with the fact that our speaker has, for a number of years, spoken freely and been a leader in the area of our concern today, and we are very happy to welcome to NASPA, Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, who will speak to us on "Concepts of Freedom." (Applause)

DR. HARRY D. GIDONSE (President, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To set the record straight, in spite of all those grand things you have been listening to, Dr. Gideonse has also been known, and is currently again known as an autocratic son of a b----. (Laughter)

I told Williamson that I would be very happy to do what he asked me to do, some four months ago. He did not name the subject as it is now listed "Concepts of Freedom." And if he had, I might have struggled a bit about re-casting it, although I know what he meant, and I think I am going to do what he meant.

The word "concepts" to me seems to indicate that one thinks that freedom is conceptual, that it is metaphysical, that it is something that is the fruit of a philosopher's concern; and, of course, to me the essence of freedom, with which I have been concerned -- not only as an administrator, but as a student -- for some thirty years now, is historical and moral. And there is very little that philosophers have contributed to an understanding or to the building of freedom. In fact, the literature, philosophically, about this subject is a semantic swamp of confusion. (Laughter) And I have once expressed that in a 40-page paper for the American Council on Education, which I called "The Literature of Freedom and Liberal Education," and it is perhaps now up to date (that paper), so if some of you are looking for a bit of moral strength in terms of a good look at a large range of the literature, you can find it there in print, with all the appropriate footnotes.

There is a danger in abstractions in this area, because the origin of freedom, where it has been achieved, is, as I said, historical and it is moral. You will find that reflected in some of the storms at Berkeley, where the students have a number of times expressed their disgust with the fact that the deans and the president, and the chancellor, seemed to find nothing to say but speeches about responsibility.

Well, this is in the very nature of things when you are discussing freedom. Carl Sandburg, who knew Abraham Lincoln's life as well as anyone -- did six fat volumes on it -- points out that the one word that Lincoln used more frequently than any other (with one exception) is freedom, and the exception is responsibility.

This is inevitable; when you are concerned with freedom you are going to be concerned with the moral sources of responsibility. If freedom is irresponsible, just doing as you please, then freedom is simply the next step before anarchy, or license, and any of us who know the tradition, politically and philosophically, of a free society, going back as far as, say, Aristotle's "Politics," know that anarchy is the next stage before despotism. When a community has to choose between anarchy and despotism, despotism is always drawn up in the camouflage of order and law, it chooses

order and law. Freedom, if it is to be realized, is always within a context of moral sources of responsibility.

I tried once to formulate in two paragraphs what, in my judgment, is the essence of the tradition of a free society, and basing it on the funeral oration of Pericles, and passages of John Stuart Mill, and other sources including Winston Churchill's statement to the Italian people after the liberation from Mussolini in 1944, I come to this formulation in two paragraphs. Every sentence of it is subject to some kind of challenge, but I think the heart of it is there.

"Freedom is defined by historic experience, by historic experience of free men. It is always characterized by the presence of choice, the right to pursue human values and purposes, and the guarantee of human and civil rights even against your own government. It calls for the limited state--that is to say, a constitution which places the government, as well as the governed, under law.

"All these historic achievements are rooted in an image of man, the whole man, with all his esthetic, moral and religious aspirations, not just man as a producer and as a consumer, in so far as his efficacy as a producer may require. It calls for an image of a man that sees him as a potential angel, as well as a potential devil, an image of a man that reminds us that the danger of the potential devil squelching the potential angel is enlarged in direct proportion to the extent to which we entrust man with unlimited power. It calls for an image of man that recognizes that freedom is the opportunity for self control, and that anything which frees the human spirit and enhances the power of man, without at the same time strengthening his capacity for self-control is pernicious."

If you want to put this in the language of a now quite fashionable religious philosopher, Martin Buber, you might say man is embodied potentiality, for good as well as for evil.

Now that is it. You can translate all that in terms of colleges, faculties, administration versus students, and pretty much all of it will stand, I believe. And if you don't think so, I am prepared to take on my share of the argument later in the afternoon.

Let me pick and choose a bit from some contemporary issues that have arisen in your bailiwick and mine. Now I am not doing any longer the job of writing a comprehensive, say, 40-page chapter in a book on the subject. I am going more or less to jump along from one current issue to another.

Take the discussion of academic freedom which is currently being confused by the introduction of a breed of animal that has come in from Germany where, as you know, there was a distinction between lehrerfreiheit and lernfreiheit (the freedom to teach and the freedom to learn), and

this has now led to a demand for something called academic freedom that I think would much better be called student freedom, because it confuses the historic achievements in the area of academic freedom.

In academic freedom, the achievements have gone from one precedent to another. You get an issue in a particular kind of institution. The lines are drawn. The Association of American University Professors comes into it, and then a decision is made, and usually made to stick after a period of time. Then there are negotiations between the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, and ultimately this changing experience, going from one concrete, historical precedent to another, leads to a reformulation of the governing charter, the governing statement, the agreement between the Association and the Professors.

Now we are getting this import from abroad, with all of the dangers of this kind of an import, because the people who are using the word lernfreiheit (freedom to learn) are blissfully unaware of the context in which historically that has grown up sometimes -- do not be confused -- not always by any manner or means, in German universities.

The context, of course, was one of economic and social mobility. The students moved from one university to another and thereby made their lernfreiheit real, because they got out from under the authority of the rector and the faculty, wherever they chose not to accept it.

It is also not appreciated that in the German context lehrerfreiheit and lernfreiheit are slogans, ideals that cover a number of things, which those who now use these ideas in an American context would totally reject.

For instance, lernfreiheit (freedom to learn) includes the freedom to challenge the faculty's right to impose any academic prerequisites in any part of the curriculum. There. That is what it is. And I have gone through some of the debates as a visiting professor, and listened with amazement at the tolerance of the faculty, which allowed this particular thing to happen to their program, which of course meant qualitative deterioration in all of the advanced subjects because prerequisites could not be made to stick.

Or take another which I encountered as a professor when I was invited as a guest professor in Berlin to lecture in a number of other German universities. And following my taste, I announced some subjects that were very academic, and some that were rather sharply current like, for instance, some aspects of current foreign policy as they affected Germany. And I would get letters back from solemn, highly reputed German academic personalities saying that they did

not like the current subjects because that was not included in academic freedom, because under academic freedom you should deal only with subjects "dan kann nicht wissenschaftlich behandelt werden," subjects that can be treated in a scholarly and scientific spirit, and the contemporary and the current is not included.

Just imagine what some of our enthusiasts for learning freedom would make of that one, and it is part of it, intimately tied up with it, that in order to preserve the freedom, you do not get involved in anything that is currently controversial, because that would be contrary to the scientific and scholarly spirit. Subjects like that cannot be academically dealt with.

Perhaps I have said enough to warn you there about some of the sloppy use that is currently creeping into our vocabulary. Student freedom would be a perfectly respectable subject, and one in which there is a whale of a lot still to be done. I am not making these remarks to deny that for one moment.

Let us take another, the current use in connection with student freedom that is made of the old standby of academic administration and the courts, in loco parentis.

Undoubtedly it has been abused in many places, and undoubtedly it should be, every time, re-thought in terms of the problems and the attitudes and the variety of insights that come with every generation. But to deny completely the validity of in loco parentis is an inexcusable historical thing to do.

If you look, for instance, at Berkeley, I am told that one-third of the Berkeley student body is graduate, and I am told the average age of those graduate students is approximately 28 years. Obviously, a doctrine like in loco parentis is not applicable to students of that type. But, and increasingly incidentally, this is going to hold for an increasing percentage of the student enrollment in American academic institutions because, as you undoubtedly know, the graduate enrollment is the most rapidly growing part of the enrollment, even if it is still a small part of the whole.

On the other hand, we have very rapid growth in enrollment in Junior Colleges, community colleges, and there is a tendency to apply the same general concepts to every situation, and these, after all, are all freshmen and sophomores, and here, without any question, in loco parentis still has a cutting edge.

If you take a college like mine, which is about the size of Berkeley -- 28,000 to 29,000 -- an overwhelmingly undergraduate, not like Berkeley with two-thirds undergraduate -- a college like mine where we have accelerated the able

students in the high schools and accelerated on the campus for the last twenty years, not just after Sputnik, and where therefore the average period of high school and college together, at least for twenty percent of the enrollment, seven years -- in other words, we have been accelerated and it has been par for the course for a long time, the average age of our students is a year younger than that in the country, at admission and at time of graduation. We therefore have thousands of 17-year old girls on the campus - if you think you can get away, as an educational institution with denying in loco parentis under those circumstances, you have another think coming about pressure groups you have not heard from yet, but which are going to be there when you make bad slips. (Laughter)

Generalities are poison in this area. You have to look at specific facts, specific circumstances, and changing facts and circumstances.

The stuff that is now going on in a parallel panel here, right here this afternoon, about seeking to find the legal foundations of due process in student discipline, and in the relationships of colleges and universities with students -- not denying, not for one moment, that there has been a great deal of unthought-through, and dogmatic and arrogant practice in many places in the past -- I regard an effort to formulate the legal bases of the relationship between a college and a student in due process, on the basis of contract law, as a completely erroneous conception of what the educational relationship between a student and a college is. And if there are a large number of new emerging legal decisions in this field, I would confidently anticipate that in some striking case that brings this principle to the fore, so that it has to be examined on its own merits conceptually, you can count on a very strong review of the existing precedents, because the law of the contract is only a very small part of the law that fundamentally governs the relationships between an educational institution and particularly undergraduate students of the type that I have been discussing. The graduate students and adults, and on the average 28-years old, that is again a different proposition.

Another point major in my judgment, because we seem to be striving in a country of which the educational system is characterized as no other country's is characterized, by diversity -- fifty states, and every state its own mixture of public and private colleges, small and big ones -- we seem to be striving for nationally binding, uniform statements. I think, myself, that it is a futile quest. I do not think that that can be done in view of the nature of the kind of educational system that America has built up through the last 200 years.

But let us put this footnote in: Freedom, which is always the basic motivating idea in this search for uniform statements, from the students to the AAUP, to even

your own organization, where aspirations of this sort are germinating in large Commissions that are confusing the subject with an enormous amount of the new mathematics and computer methods of driving scholarship to a point of total sterility. Now when you are doing all these things, you should always keep in mind that freedom, everywhere, always, where it has been historically achieved, is morally rooted in the presence of choice, the presence of option, and therefore, the basic idea that somehow freedom is to be confused with uniformity is a contradiction of the whole moral and historic history of the ideal of freedom.

Freedom is the presence of option, the presence of choice. It is, in other words, even within one system of higher education like that of the City of New York, it is the right of Hunter College to be different from Brooklyn College, of City College to be different from Queens College. It is therefore true, in terms of what I have been saying, that when there is an effort on the part of another large educational system, that of California, to impose one set of rules from the regents down to all the campuses, that is an infringement of freedom precisely because it makes for uniformity.

It is a recognition of these basic facts that I think is bewildering almost all of us to a greater or a lesser degree as we confront some of the storms that are now beating about our heads.

I am not surprised it bewilders us because Americans are philosophically an illiterate people. We regard philosophers as long-haired men living in ivory towers, and sometimes they are. And we somehow refuse to admit that underlying the freedoms which we have all in varying degrees turned into a historic reality, an achievement, there is a philosophical understanding of the bases of a free society.

It is precisely this that leads me to formulate those two paragraphs I gave you because I think, whether you accept them or not -- if you do not accept them, you can argue against them and state your own -- but some grasp, some conception, some reasoned statement of the general framework of freedom is required if you are going to fruitfully defend a position on a specific issue that arises in this tradition.

If you take Berkeley as an example, you find that the regents, the faculty, and the students all appealed to the basic value of freedom. They all meant different things but they all appealed to the basic value of freedom.

The regents appealed to freedom, although they were imposing a uniform pattern everywhere, in terms of not tolerating on the campus political activity as well as religious activity, and they took that particular power after

the faculty had practically abdicated in the area, some thirty years ago, and their defense of freedom is that this, of course, was a method of stopping subversion. But it also was a method that resulted in frustrated students, and no American college or university worth its salt would deny that religion and education have one thing in common. They are both of them, at their best, man on his knees worshipping what might be rather than what is, and if you forbid this kind of activity because you are scared of the consequences in the community -- and in California you well might be scared because it is a state characterized by a lunatic fringe on both the right and the left, so large that those in the middle hardly can count themselves (laughter), and therefore the regents seek for safety by prohibiting life. You cannot do that.

Obviously, students should be led to an interest in active participation in moral and political concerns, and here you have, therefore, a clear abuse of freedom in a search ostensibly motivated by it. The faculty has for many years now in California, used the undergraduate baccalaureate enrollment as a statistical basis for which to get huge budgets which are then used for the graduate and research programs. (Laughter)

When the faculty considers its role now, it puts out a report -- many of you have seen it -- in which it does not say even one word about the way in which the faculty in California, and specifically Berkeley, has used its professional privileges to turn them into professional perquisites and to dress them up as if they were professional freedom.

This again is abuse and has nothing whatsoever to do with an honest cultivation of a quest for an understanding of what freedom today might mean in a situation of the type I am discussing.

Then you have this insistence on the part of the faculty that freedom, once it had been given to them by the regents, must mean total freedom -- no control at all of the content of what is said when freedom is exercised.

Immediately, because this means that if you say freedom is the right to do as you please (which is the classic definition of anarchy and license), you get the students walking around with the four letter words and speaking on the campus about methods of conducting sexual intercourse with several partners at the same time, or speaking on the campus to raise funds for the support of Viet Cong, which of course a child can understand is a movement that is killing American boys in uniform, and bombing Saigon U.S. embassies, which is therefore conduct that is clearly defined in the classical legal formula of giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and you will recall that that is the definition in our courts of treason.

Clearly then, that cannot be tolerated. This was a faculty policy. And you all know the story. This is finally the point in which Clark Kerr became impatient enough to say that he would have to resign. Then we got, finally, a statement that maybe this total freedom would have to be curbed in some way, and faculty committees presumably are now struggling over the language in which this is to be formulated.

I do not need to tell you about the students' use of freedom. It covered just about everything that you could possibly imagine, in both the form of abuse and exercise of freedom. There is one thing you can say for the students: They have been, whether they knew that this was the cause of their alienation or not, exploited by the changing character of the university. Quality educational resources were not devoted to the specific functions of the baccalaureate program, and they, therefore, can perhaps be more easily excused for their misunderstanding, an occasional misconduct, because at least they had been thoroughly victimized by both the regents and the faculty who gave definitions of freedom that have no relationship whatsoever to the necessities and the requirements of the educational program.

I want to close with a reminder, again, of the last words of that statement, the words in which freedom, following in this case Kant and following in this case Goethe, is defined as the opportunity for self-control as opposed to non-freedom which is control by others. Whether that is the faculty, or the administration, or a power lusty government of one sort or another does not make any difference.

Freedom is the opportunity for self-control, and a claim for freedom should be tested by evidence of rightness for self-control.

That, of course, raises the whole problem of what to the modern, in his anxiety, the word "self" is -- a very big subject for another panel and another seminar. Clearly "self" is today interpreted very frequently in the sense of the adjective "selfish," and "self-centered." Self is not interpreted in terms of the sense of identity and assurance that you get when you face very many possibly conflicting options in the use of your self and your mind, and your soul in a pluralistic world in which there are all sorts of motives at work in addressing those appeals to you, and in which clearly the sense of identity, of strength of self comes from a reasoned awareness of the options before us, from a reasoned rank ordering of the priorities to which you might devote your personal qualities, whatever they are, so that I am basically saying that self-control is rooted in an awareness of the moral context in which we operate. It is rooted in an awareness of the rank order of the priorities to which you commit yourself. And in that sense, of course, it becomes understandable again to say that you love

your neighbor as you love yourself. If you merely love your neighbor, as many moderns love themselves -- which is a very questionable doctrine, because the average modern has no love, not even respect, for himself -- self then has to be re-interpreted in this sense of a reasoned rank order of priority that restores identity to the conception you have of yourself.

If you keep that in mind, then I think you will find the intellectual tool of approaching a claim for new and emerging freedom as an opportunity for self-control a very rewarding pedagogical device.

Thank you. (Applause)

SEMINAR
"Fraternities and the Student
Personnel Administrator --
The Crucial Issues"
Monday - April 5, 1965

The Seminar convened at two-fifteen o'clock, Dean William R. Nester, Dean of Men, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, presiding.

CHAIRMAN NESTER: I would like to welcome you to this session entitled "Fraternities and the Student Personnel Administrator -- The Crucial Issues." The format for this afternoon will be a presentation of a paper, with four distinguished reactors, then you who will participate at a later time, please be prepared with questions and comments, because this is a very vital question, and I think the attendance here demonstrates that fact very clearly.

Our speaker today is well known to all of his colleagues in the student personnel area. His most distinguished achievement in recent months was to become a new father.

He was formerly associated with Kent State University. He serves in the very important capacity as educational adviser to the National Inter-Fraternity Conference; he serves in two capacities at this time at the University of Vermont, namely, Dean of Men, and Acting Dean of Students.

We are very pleased to have as our principal Roland Patzer. (Applause)

DEAN ROLAND PATZER (Dean of Men, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont): Thank you, Bill.

As Earl Clifford knows, it's those long winter nights that finally enabled us to be parents, Bill. (Laughter)

To undertake to speak on the topic of "Fraternities--the Crucial Issues" is a task for which this author might well be subjected to severe scholarly rebuke from his colleagues if it were presented as a singlehanded effort. To avoid this charge of plagiarism and in order that due credit is given, I must confess that the "issues" to be described are the result of tireless hours of thought on the part of my colleagues on the NASPA Fraternity Relations Commission.

To better understand the basis of our deliberations as well as to provide therapy for the Commission membership, I should like to briefly describe the make-up of this Commission. The Commission is sub-divided into four cores. Representative deans from geographical regions form an East Core, Mid-West Core, West Core and Southern Core.

We have been accused by a number of our fraternity friends as representatives of the Congress on Racial Equality. If that is too deep -- (Laughter) On the other hand, some of our colleagues in NASPA have assailed us for reflecting a biased fraternity point of view; yet less than fifty percent of membership has had any undergraduate fraternity affiliation. Through a typographical error we have also been dubbed as the Commission on "Fraternity Prayers." (Laughter) Expressions of the Commission membership's independence of thought is evidenced by the fact it has twice attempted to impeach its chairman. If you do not know, I happen to be the chairman. (Laughter)

Despite our struggles we have been highly task oriented. In December when the Executive Committee asked the Commission to define the crucial issues we set about to divide the issues into two categories. First those issues which were of an organizational nature -- ones which concerned NASPA as a national organization. Second, those of a service nature -- crucial issues which are to be viewed as an aid to member deans in any fraternity program.

Our task was not to provide definitive resolutions to any issue but to form a base upon which NASPA could entertain further study and direction to a highly complex and controversial area in higher education.

My assignment today as I see it is to define these issues with the hope that we may begin to find solutions.

Our first crucial issue under the umbrella of organizational issues is NASPA's Relationship to National Interfraternity Conference, National Panhellenic and individual National Fraternities and Sororities. Historically, a variety of relationships, both formal and informal, have existed between representatives of NASPA and these organizations. While a variety of contacts have occurred it was not until last year that NASPA offered associate membership to fraternity representatives.

This fact alone presupposes that there is a desire to open channels of communication with the "fraternity world." This "world" is very complex and mysterious. Complex in the sense that these organizations alter in leadership from year to year, and the voices of the fraternity world are fractionalized still further by such organizations as College Fraternity Secretaries Association, the Fraternity Scholarship Association, College Fraternity Editors Association, Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council, and others. Mysterious because the conceptions on the part of the academic world vary in intensity and accuracy regarding the above-mentioned organizations. Based upon a most subjective survey I find that most deans do not understand the nature and functions of these organizations, or if they do understand, they are dissatisfied with the current nature and function.

Presupposing there is a desire on the part of NASPA to effect change, then 1) to what degree do we open up channels of communication both within our organizations and with the respective fraternity organizations? 2) To what degree are we as a national organization willing to take stands on the crucial issues that we can define? Lastly, 3) to what degree are we willing to assume responsibility in bringing about effective change in fraternity movement?

The second organizational crucial issue is a "definition of the role of the fraternity in the college community." I might add parenthetically that I am using the word "fraternity" throughout in its broadest sense encompassing fraternities and sororities. One of the first questions that may be raised about this issue is the fact that at some of our member institutions college fraternities have no role and may never have one. However, for the vast majority of our membership college fraternities exist on our campus and while we may have defined this role for our own college or university we have never as a national organization clearly spelled out their place in higher education. I think this is particularly important, because if we expect the fraternity world to understand and to fulfill any expectation then we are obligated to resolve this issue.

NASPA's role in fraternity research is the fourth crucial issue. This is but a segment of a much broader issue regarding our role in related areas of student personnel research. The establishment of repositories and libraries for the vast amount of research undertaken each year, the initiation of research by NASPA, as well as the evaluation of research in this area are relevant factors in the discussion of this issue.

I might add that just yesterday our Commission met and entertained a proposal and made a recommendation to the Executive Committee that we assist in the planning of a study on rushing as proposed by the College Fraternity Secretaries

and the National Interfraternity Conference. To me this is the first step of the kind of communication and the kind of cooperative venture that I think is needed in this area.

Each of us is subject to periodic reviews of our programs and practices by external and internal evaluating mechanisms, i.e., self-studies, accreditation teams, etc. The fourth crucial issue deals with NASPA's responsibility in the evaluation of National Fraternities and Sororities. From time to time all of us have expressed concern about practices and procedures of some National Fraternities which run counter to the basic philosophies of education. What then is our collective role in dealing with these practices? What mechanisms can be developed that can effectively communicate our concerns to the nationals?

As a matter of fact, in talking to some deans, I find there is a uniform trend with certain people that in attempting to communicate to a national there is no one to communicate with. We have nationals still that have no professional staff and have no way to begin any kind of basic communication. How do we find ways in which we can establish this communication?

NASPA's responsibility in the communication of current educational trends to National Fraternity and Sorority leaders is the fifth crucial issue. This issue is not unrelated to our initial current issue. Here, however, we are dealing with a problem of continual turnover in fraternity ranks and the mechanics of providing fraternity policy-makers knowledge about the constantly changing climate of higher education. What kind of leadership techniques should NASPA sponsor to communicate this information?

We have difficulty within our own ranks of communicating the changing environment and the changing role of higher education. But somehow it must be communicated to those who not only are professionals in the fraternity world but to those who are volunteers in the fraternity world.

One of the most glaring issues is the economic future of National Fraternities and Sororities. Improved housing and improved programs can only be accomplished by more imaginative financing. The effects of local, state and federal tax legislation as well as H.H.F.A. legislation suggest a few areas for investigation. The greater need for increased and more competent staff in fraternity management requires additional funds. Evidences of the lag in proportionate membership increases based upon high cost to the student, needs to be studied.

More and more studies that I have reviewed seem to indicate the two basic reasons that students do not pledge fraternities is the fact that the cost is too much and it takes up too much time. I have no figures to indicate how

much fraternity fees are going up in comparison to college tuition. Sometimes the practices of our financial aid people in terms of not considering fraternity membership as a part of the financial aid function, is also a practice that needs to be considered by us as an organization.

The growth of the larger, wealthy fraternities and the demise of small nationals is a growing concern among the fraternity world. Is it a growing concern among us as deans? What then is NASPA's role, if any, in sound planning with the fraternity world of a sounder economic base?

The communications problems involving various fraternity and sorority publications of all types is the last in the category of organization issues. What should be NASPA's role in taking stands regarding the kinds of materials that cross our desks daily?

It is interesting to note comments from deans that several kinds of publications which have no official sanction by anyone, apparently (but somebody had enough money to feed into it), come across our desk that are most repugnant to most deans. Yet they seem to give the impression that there is some official sanction from the fraternity world. Many have criticized the fact that some of the publications are political in nature. Certainly any fraternity organization may have the right to be political in nature, but I wonder, does it help the fraternity system? I think this is where some of the questions are being raised by many.

I also have heard comments by deans who have been asked to make contributions to fraternity magazines, who have said that they do not recognize their articles sometimes after they have submitted it for publication, because it has been cut extensively.

Again, what is our responsibility to communicate these concerns to the policy makers of publications that sometimes provide a greater disservice to not only fraternities but to higher education as well?

We believe then that these are the crucial issues that we as a NASPA organization must face and resolve.

Of equal importance, however, is the service that we must provide our fellow deans. I think all of us recognize that as Deans of Men or Deans of Students, we are finding that we are spending less and less time in actual fraternity affairs, and that we are resolving our problem by hiring staff who are primarily concerned with the activities of fraternities.

Because of the high mobility of this kind of staff it means a complete training for them. We find, at least I have found that I have received more and more letters each

year requesting help by a dean or an assistant dean who needs some kind of counsel and advice in dealing with fraternity matters. And there is no source at the present time. There are some sources in NIC and by individual fraternities, but there is no organized source. What is our responsibility, what is our service in this?

We have suggested thirteen kinds of services that are to us crucial issues that we should be providing for our own membership:

- (1) Recommended environmental standards for chapter houses:
 - a. Physical plant (study-sleeping areas, dining-food service areas, lounge-recreational areas, library-cultural accouterments)
 - b. Operations (fiscal, safety, sanitation)

Frankly, to do a job, I think the kind of approach should be the same as used by the Ford Facilities Laboratory in terms of our housing on campus. We have just scratched the surface in this whole area. We have had one Commission working on this area, but certainly information in depth on these environmental standards is vital and necessary.

- (2) Definition of National Fraternity and Sorority, local fraternity and sorority, institutional relationship.

The variety of rules and regulations that exist among national organizations in terms of policies that they have are fantastic. Any of you who deal with sixty or more fraternities in attempting to understand and recognize the various practices and the various regulations that they have must recognize some frustration in knowing that, for example, you must sign a scholarship card for x-fraternity because they require it as a minimum pledge standard for their particular national. Just the mere understanding of what these rules and regulations are is a most frustrating and complex problem.

What should the role of the local fraternity be, local versus national fraternities, on one's campus? This is an issue that has become increasingly more important in some of the regions of the country.

- (3) The role of local IFC's and Alumni Interfraternity Councils.

We should be providing monographs for the varying kinds of organizations, what they do, and what would be the advantages of the varying kinds.

- (4) Means of extending student personnel resources into the chapter house as an alternative to

supervision (philosophy, personnel, program)

There are a number of interesting experiments that are occurring throughout the country: The use of graduate counselors in resident halls, as opposed to head residents, or supplementing head residents; the use of fraternities as extensions of classrooms in the sense of having evening courses. Somehow we need to communicate these kinds of experiments to our own membership so they know about it and get some kind of evaluation as to their function. There are of course other kinds of possibilities in this particular area that we need to communicate to our own constituents.

- (5) Defining academic objectives and developing intellectual climates in fraternity and sorority programs.

Right now we stick to the standard pattern of reporting of the All Men's average and the fraternity scholarship report. But this, I think, goes beyond this. What kind of imaginative programs, and what are our objectives in setting up a climate in a fraternity and sorority program? Again, we need to communicate these things to our deans.

- (6) Developing standards for the acceptability of various National Fraternities and Sororities.

Here again I can count at least once a month on a new dean entertaining the possibility of establishing a fraternity or sorority system on their campus and asking what are the measurements that one uses in bringing chapters on to our campus. We need to provide some models for our people, to be able to deal with this appropriately, and not all of a sudden have a full rush of chapters on to a campus with no order.

- (7) The role of faculty in relationship to fraternities and sororities.

This is most significant today. Let me speak to a study that our own Inter-Fraternity Council and our Alumni Inter-Fraternity Council developed. At least they raised the money for the study. They raised some \$2,000 for a clinical psychologist, an educational psychologist, and a sociologist, plus a staff person in our office to do an attitude study, both from faculty and students. The results are just coming out now. Interestingly enough, we found on our campus (and I am sure this is not unlike most) that 65 percent, a little better than 65 percent of the faculty have never set foot in a fraternity house.

My conversations with faculty advisers, not only on my own campus but throughout the country, lead me to believe that advising a fraternity as far as their own professional growth is concerned, is the very antithesis of their develop-

ment at this particular time. A faculty member should steer away -- most of their colleagues suggest they steer away -- from fraternities and sororities. And the ones of the faculty that do, frankly, are not very high in the status of their own college and departments. You can answer this better than I, because you deal with it too. But I am convinced that somehow we have to bring the role of the faculty -- define the role and bring the faculty back into the relationship of the fraternity and sorority.

- (8) Impact of changes in membership policy on local chapters and the role of the Dean in these changes.

Here again I think there has been a lot of discussion, but not very much honest dialog and honest information is disseminated on the impact of these changes.

I would say that from a crucial situation we have a lot to be concerned with, perhaps not so much in the fraternity area, but I can say I think we have a lot to be concerned with in the sorority area in this area.

- (9) The fraternity experience as a vehicle for encouraging concern for the important human and social issues.

Another interesting thing came out of this study at Vermont. The question was asked, "Which are more religious, fraternity men or non-fraternity men?" In this particular sample I think we got a good sample of both populations, the fraternity and non-fraternity population. The interesting results were that the non-fraternity man was more religiously oriented. This may be a peculiarity to our campus, but it is interesting in light of the fact that most fraternities have a religious orientation in their own structure.

I am not suggesting that religion and human social values necessarily go together here either. I think there are some problems here of definition. But I am suggesting that most of the programs that have been developed are pretty tired, such as helping orphans or raising money. We really haven't gotten down, in terms of advising fraternities, to grips with the real social issues that are prevalent in the student culture at least at the present time. Somehow we need to communicate some of the dramatic possibilities in this area to our own constituents.

- (10) Impact of time pressures on all phases of fraternity life.

Here again, as I see it at least in some of the studies that have been proposed or that have been developed, one of the reasons the student does not join a fraternity is

because of this feeling that it is going to take up a lot of time that he cannot afford to spend away from his academic work. I think, too, there has been an unfortunate going away from setting up priorities, and an unfortunate emphasis on too many trivia in terms of the fraternity, most typical fraternity operations, and I think some suggestions and some analysis of some imaginative programs in this area might well come out of any study of this type.

- (11) Economic dimensions, both capital and operational, in fraternity management.

Here again I think there are some techniques that may be working and have been working for years in some places such as the cooperative management and cooperative planning. I think this will help some of the very real fundamental economic problems of chapters. The cry is, we cannot fix up our house, we cannot meet the standards, because we do not have the money. And if you talk to fiscal officers, you recognize soon that they will say, "Gentlemen, that is a very uneconomic operation. Throw it out."

I am suggesting there are techniques, and there are ways in which a little more order can come to fraternity management that would allow the improvements for many chapters that are so necessary.

- (12) NASPA, federal and state legislation and fraternities (housing, civil rights, membership, taxation)

We need to provide our membership with the latest information that affects fraternities. We need to make our constituency aware of what kinds of effect these various kinds of legislation have on fraternities.

- (13) The need to develop an educational program to assist fraternities to deal with problems resulting from changing social conditions.

This is very easy to say, and I think we need to inform our constituency about techniques that can be used to allow a consciousness of these changes.

As a person coming from the midwest to New England, I think I can say that one of the real interesting phenomena I see about New England fraternities -- and you from New England can attack me later -- is that there has been a divorce from the fraternity system here on one hand, and the university and its change on the other hand. This divorce has been of such long standing that it is pretty difficult for the two to ever get together, and one must do this in order to effect any kind of change, I think. For many schools, as you see the frustration and result, it is, "Well, why bother? Let's just eliminate the cause. It is

too late." This is one way. I would not argue the fact that this is one way of attempting to solve a problem.

But if you believe that there are some inherent values in a fraternity system, then I think we have to find some methods and means in which to have an effect on altering the social conditions.

These, then, are the issues as we see them. I hope I have not left the impression that if we were to resolve these issues we will have solved all problems of fraternities in higher education. If we lived in an ordered and tidy world this might be possible. However, I do believe that if NASPA begins to exercise leadership and become a task oriented organization by facing these issues, I think we will see some changes toward the good.

However, if we continue to remain silent, or if we continue to grumble in an unorganized fashion, then I think it will be left to chance and other influences that may not be of our own desire and of our own making, to change the fraternity picture for many of us on our local campuses.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN NESTER: Thank you, Roland, for that thoughtful and challenging presentation.

We have about forty-five minutes for questions and discussion, and we do have four professional reactors up here, but we would like to dub all of you as reactors to Roland's presentation.

May I present the men who have been selected to react to Roland's presentation. I will present them all at once, and then they can come up for a two or three minute crack. I believe their titles and background will speak for the reason of their selection for this reaction session.

I would first like to present Hadley DePuy, better known as "Stretch", who is Dean of Men at Franklin and Marshall College.

I would next like to present Bob Krovitz who is past president of College Fraternity Secretaries Association, is president-elect of the National Inter-Fraternity Conference, and in his spare time is Chairman of the Board of Quincy Junior College.

John Feldkamp is our next reactor, who has been Counselor for Fraternities at Michigan for several years and is currently serving as Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

The last young man is Richard Fletcher, who is the

Executive Secretary of Sigma Nu Fraternity, and probably the most popular speaker on the national scene in fraternity affairs.

DEAN HADLEY DePUY (Dean of Men, Franklin and Marshall College): Gentlemen: We each have three minutes. I have decided what would be most helpful for the three minutes I have. I am going to speak for two minutes; for the next minute I will ask you to stand and come up and get a drink of water. I will ask you to sit after a minute. Would you come up and do whatever you wish. I think that will be more helpful and relaxing than anything I may say. [Short recess]

I am certain some of you did not have an opportunity to hear the entire presentation Roland made, and it is too bad, because it was well done. But any man who would write the following sentence needs some translation, and I quote the section, indeed a paragraph, but it has just one period in it, written by our distinguished colleague.

Before we go much further, I think all of you who do not know Roland Patzer, who is a Dean of Students at the Burlington Community College (laughter), should be aware of the fact that he is one of the best butts for jokes in the business, and I think the reason is self-apparent. (Laughter)

Roland was here before some of you came in, and I will try to recap in a few seconds what happened before some of you arrived.

He was up here fiddling with a large number of knobs for reasons which weren't apparent to us at first. When the music was turned up, it was obvious he was impressed with this topic, and trying to find the right tune. When the lights began to fade out it was clear he wanted to operate in the dark; and then when the microphone didn't work, it was clear he didn't want to be heard. But in spite of all this his message came across.

I want to give you a very brief summary of this. This is in way of a dirty trick. He called a meeting I could not attend, to learn my role, last night.

First of all, Roland said that the whole topic is over the head of about fifty percent of our membership. (Laughter) Secondly, he said that he was referring to the Commission on Fraternity Relations, and he said that the committee is task oriented. This is true. This was best exemplified by his own allusion to the Chairman's activities during the long winter nights. (Laughter) While we understood this task orientation, his reference to Earl Clifford as one who would have firsthand experiences in relationship to his long winter nights' activities left us all cold.

Thirdly, he said that NASPA has been operating under an umbrella. I think when it comes to the topic of fraternities that is a good, safe place to be in a storm.

Fourthly, he gave us a definition of fraternities and wanted to make it clear to us that he was defining fraternities in the broadest sense, to include sororities as well. (Laughter) He did not mean to imply that there is no difference between fraternities and sororities on the U.V. campus.

Related to this, he indicated later on that he would be most willing to extend student personnel services into the fraternities. I do not know what he meant by this, in terms of sororities, but he went on a little later to talk about experimenting with functions, and that is dangerous. (Laughter)

He indicated that he didn't understand the rules and regulations, and I think that was apparent by his whole presentation.

He talked a bit briefly about the staff he was bringing into his office, a clinical psychologist to study him (laughter) -- I think this was a mistake.

He said that on many campuses faculty have not even set a foot in a fraternity house. Frankly, gentlemen, with regard to women guests, I wish that was the only part of the anatomy that touched base in our fraternity houses.

He talked about a study at U.V. and also indicated they were raising orphans there. (Laughter)

These things give you some idea of the classical background our distinguished Chairman brings, and the source of information today.

I look around this room and I see men like Don DuShane and Fred Turner and Bill Griffith, and a number of other men whom I know and have a great deal of respect for. I know whatever I could tell you, even in terms of reaction as to Roland's fine presentation, would be really a superficial attempt.

I am Dean of Men at Franklin and Marshall College, which is a small men's school in Pennsylvania Dutch country. Pennsylvania Dutchmen are not given to "educationese." For instance, this delightful paragraph that Roland included in his speech: Our task was "to form a base upon which NASPA could entertain further study and direction to a highly complex and controversial area in higher education." Frankly, I didn't have the foggiest idea what he was talking about. To get you out of your kind of safe "educationese" I am going to give eleven salty sayings in forms of reaction to what

Roland said based on some things I heard down in Pennsylvania Dutch country that might be helpful. This is particularly helpful to all of you concerned about fraternities on your campuses.

In regard to item 1, the Pennsylvania Dutch have a wonderful saying, "While the doctors consult, the patient dies."

In many sections of the country it is clear that there is a great deal of fraternity indifference on the local level to the issues which really face our fraternities, and our Pennsylvania Dutch friends would say, "Even the lion must defend himself against gnats." They also say that "he who has a bad name is half hanged."

Fraternities should listen to criticism and to critics, but the trouble is to determine which critics are worth listening to. For instance, with regard to the faculty "If the beard were all, a goat might preach." (Laughter)

With regard to some of the young war hawks on our various faculties, "Orators are driven by their weakness to make noise as lame men take to horses." Or, perhaps more appropriately, "A critic is a legless man who teaches running." (Laughter)

There has been much conversation in our country and in our commission about the role students should play in the governance of institutions. Indeed, the whole question of how we prepare our young men and young women for life in a very busy and active world is a key point. Many of us defend the principle of eliminating in loco parentis. Fraternities are a good way to do this. Many who are opposed to fraternities forget that in this microcosm much can be learned about democracy and responsibility. And I would suggest that some of them take heed to the statement made that "women are not much, but they are the best other sex we have." (Laughter)

I am one of those in favor of studies of fraternity systems and am extremely proud of the CFSA and NIC study on fraternity rushing, which our Commission has supported. I would use this Pennsylvania Dutch saying, "The mirror shows everyone his best friend."

Deans may be poor critics for fraternities to listen to. "If Jack is in love, he's no judge of Jill's beauty." However, the deans, including personnel deans, are in the best positions to communicate with the fraternity world because they know and understand problems of the national and local fraternities.

Deans should get involved, and so should NASPA, for one good reason, NASPA and our deans have been conspicuously absent in many areas at many times, and so one could safely

say that, in order to avoid this next Pennsylvania Dutch saying, we should get involved in helping the fraternity system and calling attention to its problems and weaknesses, "It takes little effort to watch a man carry a load."

Now some quickies -- this is a shotgun approach, but I think it might be helpful to you: "Deans should be a little bit more concerned about the poor chapter and get at it." "Pardoning the bad is injuring the good."

It seems to me that fraternity local chapters should heed the advice and criticism and support of the various student personnel officers. "Wise men learn by others' bellyaches; fools by their own."

One of the things that concerns me and concerns some of the rest of us is really what other powers besides the National Inter-Fraternity Conference and the Secretaries Association are really involved in promoting some aspects of the fraternity life. I am particularly concerned about some of the business interests that have a deep involvement in national fraternities. "The art of the merchant lies more in getting paid than in making sales."

Some of the small fraternities should consider staying small and avoid the old Pennsylvania Dutch saying, "There is no eel so small but it hopes to become a whale."

It seems to me that when we bring new chapters of new fraternities on our campuses deans can be helpful by being fully aware of what the national organization stands for and the caliber of its leadership. "Observe the mother before you take the daughter."

When a chapter is weak, do not forget about it and put the spotlight only on the successful chapter. Remember, "Everyone bastes the fat hog while the lean one burns."

In closing, it seems to me that we have some difficult problems facing national fraternities and the fraternity world that deans should be interested in and NASPA should be interested in, but they are not absolute problems, and they do not require absolute answers. Remember, as one old Amish man told me one time, "A black hen can lay a white egg."
(Applause)

CHAIRMAN NESTER: Thank you very much, Stretch, and I would like to assure you in the audience that you may react to the reactors as well as to Roland. (Laughter)

MR. ROBERT KROVITZ (Vice President, National Inter-Fraternity Conference): I shall try to confine my remarks, with limitations of time in mind, specifically as a reactor to Roland's talk, particularly in connection with NIC (National Inter-Fraternity Conference) involvement.

Under the organizational crucial issues Roland listed as number one, to what degree do we open up channels of communication. I would suggest that that statement be amended to read, "To what degree should we expand our channels of communication?" I do believe we have opened up channels of communication in the recent past in particular, and we are planning to expand these channels. Perhaps I might list just a few of them.

We have a committee known as a liaison committee. From that committee they developed in part the core committee that Roland talked about. For the past two years we have had at least two or three meetings of what we call representative deans to sit down with the executive committee of the National Inter-Fraternity Conference and discuss community problems.

Roland's role and official title as Educational Adviser to NIC is certainly a very important channel of communication, and with his increasing service -- I think this is his second year -- I think he has been properly oriented and is in the process of opening up these channels further.

The publications that the NIC attempts to distribute (publish), where we have the Yearbook and many other publications and communications that are distributed free to the deans, are being enlarged. The publications committee has ambitious plans for the near future. I have heard them.

The use of the central office for inquiries, many of which are channeled to our currently 26 standing committees, involving practically every aspect of fraternity operation, has active chairmen working on these. Some are more knowledgeable than others, perhaps, but the attempt to answer these inquiries is made. And with the more solid contributions of the NIC office in the process of involvement, perhaps this can be expanded further.

The joint study that Roland referred to on rushing is a further expansion of this communications channel, and I would suggest that -- rather, there is another area for better communications that is currently being planned. As a matter of fact it is already listed on the program for the National Inter-Fraternity Conference to be held this December in Washington, D. C., to have a specific session scheduled, and is scheduled, during the conference for Deans and Deans only, primarily programs for new Deans, new personnel, for orientation and communication. This is the first time, in my knowledge, this is being scheduled at the Conference.

Under the organizational crucial issues -- jumping now to his fourth presentation on fraternity research -- I do not know, and this is a form of a question to NASPA, whether or not NASPA has a research committee chairman as such, a chairman to coordinate the activities in the research area.

I would suggest that this coordinator explore additional projects, other projects, that might be studied, other than rushing, and work closely with our NIC research chairman, Dr. Clyde Johnson.

A fifth crucial issue which I just want to touch upon -- and Roland only touched upon it -- is relative to housing. He touched upon it both in organization and in service. The National Inter-Fraternity Conference, one of its standing committees on graduate affairs, involves the encouragement and help in assisting to organize new inter-fraternity alumni councils and to strengthen old ones. The recent Manual of Operations and Objectives is still available to all deans, all student personnel people.

In addition to that, I would suggest that NASPA take advantage of the speakers' bureau, another standing committee of NIC, to provide assistance to new councils.

I wish I had time to talk about some of these objectives and the real need, the great need for the organization and function of Inter-Fraternity Alumni Councils as another adjunct to the educational structure.

Lastly, I want to call your attention to a recent study that I have not had the opportunity to study in detail, but based on excerpts from the President of the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey, in a speech given at the annual meeting last October, of the College Entrance Boards, based on a study initiated by a sociology professor, I believe, at the University of California at Los Angeles, in elaborating upon the sub-cultures divided into four or five areas, such as academic, vocational, collegiate, a surprising conclusion was reached. This speech was quoted rather widely in the press last November and December. One of the conclusions which appeared to be rather distressing and disturbing was the fact that 51 percent of this rather extensive study indicated that the collegiate sub-culture in this typography, defined as those more concerned -- there were freshmen and sophomores both involved -- with the fun-loving aspects of collegiate life, parties, social affairs, etcetera, gives the NIC, and it should give NASPA, a lot of food for thought.

I am suggesting very strongly, from the NIC point of view, in the recent declaration of principles and action, that the NIC and the college secretaries are concerned with the encouragement of not only high scholarship but the development of cultural and intellectual attainments of its chapters. In providing a better climate for this, I am suggesting that we give a little more than lip service to it. I believe the Deans of Personnel can implement that course of action far better than many others, being on the grassroots scene, working with the IFC's, through its student leaders, working to encourage the formal-informal, if

we can call it that, program of cultural-intellectual development. The use of the faculty -- I could go on and on and spell out a program. Time will not permit.

This is my reaction, in the limited time allotted, to Roland's talk. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN NESTER: Thank you, Bob.

DEAN JOHN FELDKAMP (Counselor for Fraternities, University of Michigan): I jotted down just a few notes in a few areas I feel I would like to expand upon from my own very limited vantage point with communities.

No doubt there is a very large place, and a very definite place in the future for fraternities. Certainly the development outside the classroom is something everyone in this room is concerned with, and I think that very few of us can disagree that fraternities have a great potential and in many cases have shown a great effectiveness as ideal housing units, as small groups where the impact upon the individual members is great, and the influence of these groups, when set in the right direction, is certainly in line with the objectives of education. So I see no doubt that in the future there is going to be a very definite place for our fraternities.

Some of the problems though that arise, and that I keep seeing, one is in learning the various relationships that a chapter has with other units, other groups.

The most difficult relationship I think the undergraduate chapters face is defining what their obligations are, first to their school, and what their obligations are to their fraternity. It is very difficult because this is not well known to them. It is not a point, I am afraid, that is discussed often enough.

I think it is certainly wrong to say that these students, these undergraduates, do not feel a very close tie with their school, for this is where they came in contact with their fraternity. I think that the chapters on the individual campuses have very strong loyalties to their institution that are not recognized by the general fraternity.

The chapter at the school, I think, tries to be in line with the school's policies, and they want to be, and I think the fraternity has to come to appreciate the desires of its members and help work with them in seeing that they come in line with the school's policies, and yet stay in the context of their fraternity's policies also.

I think one area that has been an area of great confusion is the question of membership selection and the

discrimination question. I think the students have very strong feelings in line with their institutions, that are not fully known and appreciated.

I think the question of fraternities or sororities existing apart from educational institutions is a very disturbing one that has arisen quite recently.

I was very encouraged, and I know the Commission was encouraged last year when Bert Bennett from the NIC stated that he felt this was not what the NIC was trying to foster, and that very few fraternities would want to exist apart from the educational institution at which they are located.

I think we have to recognize that perhaps the greatest influences on fraternities -- another point -- is the IFC. I think if any one thing controls the policies of fraternities, the correction of fraternities, it is the local IFC. This is not the best group for this. Certainly the Inter-Fraternity Council officers, the men who are really making the changes, are not frequently the best fraternity men. In fact, we have had a very disturbing trend where these turn out to be the men that are not even living in fraternity houses, and many times have sacrificed any leadership positions at all in their fraternities to become a campus leader near the IFC, and yet it is the IFC that is in fact guiding fraternities and making the policies and, I think, is the number one influence on fraternities.

Who are the people who influence the IFC officers? That is the next question. They, I think, are your student personnel workers and in particular your fraternity advisers. And this presents problems that are not difficult to solve.

I think it is wrong to expect that we are going to have a topflight, well paid position at every campus for a fraternity adviser. I do not see where it can become anything more than a stepping stone to other work in student personnel. I do not think that a man who is ambitious in student personnel work could be expected to stay in that position for more than two or three years. So you have this constant turnover, and this problem of educating this adviser to the ways of fraternities so he in turn can be an influence on the IFC.

I think it can be solved in part by having your whole staff of student personnel workers very knowledgeable about fraternities. I think that this should be a goal of national fraternities and other groups to deal with all the student personnel workers and not just the fraternity adviser.

And perhaps this will have to be solved in the future in bigger systems with the IFC itself hiring somebody

who can do this work.

A sixth problem that I think is perhaps the biggest one to getting many of these others solved, is the need for a dialog, a very frank dialog too, discussing the problems and bringing these out right into the open. I have been very encouraged by the dialog I have been able to develop with a number of individuals, and I think that has certainly been the source of nearly all the knowledge I have gained in fraternities. I think a number of problems are just the product of the fact that we do not have this dialog.

I think the question of local autonomy is really just a product of ignorance, because I do not see where you can have, in fact, fraternities as we know them without alumni and without their national organizations. Yet people cannot appreciate this on the surface. It is something that has to be gone into more deeply. So we need a dialog on problems like that.

A dialog on membership selection is vital. Here is a moving force in today's society, and yet many people do not want to talk about it. If we are going to ignore it, in the next two years it is going to become crucial in every Greek letter organization.

So I think in Roland's speech we have seen a number of areas come out. I hope we will continue to discuss these. I think that Roland and his commission have done a great service to everyone concerned through the work that has been accomplished in defining where are these problem areas.

Those are my reactions. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN NESTER: Thank you, John.

Anchor man, Dick Fletcher.

MR. RICHARD FLETCHER (Executive Secretary, Sigma Nu, Lexington, Virginia): Bill, an anchor is that which renders that which might be mobile, immobile. I appear in the role of the anchor man simply by virtue of no strength to fit the assignment.

At the tail end of the table I have listened with interest to reactions which express, I hope, for all of us concerned with fraternities, interlineally a deep appreciation to the core groups, and I use the term advisedly, and to its estimable Chairman, Mr. Patzer, for his leadership in identifying problems.

My role is that of a Sigma unclear Nu reactor. I am prepared for my assignment. I attended a NASPA meeting three years ago and caught the key word immediately, dichotomy. Two years ago I came up again with a password, ambivalence. This is progress. Dichotomy, split; ambivalence, I

am undecided. Now we are talking about dialog. We have made progress and we are prepared to assault the whole business of becoming task oriented. (Laughter)

I support then our optimism in terms of the progress of NASPA. My preliminary reaction in an effort to identify with some erstwhile colleagues is that systemic ailments are endemic (laughter); and if you will forgive that, we will go immediately to the major area of Roland's fine paper, insofar as I am concerned, the reaction to the organizational concerns expressed there.

In a list of seven, I found six which it seemed to me were hardly worth debating -- the role of the fraternity in the college community, the need for vital research, the business of appraisals constantly, evaluation, the identification of educational trends, the expression of economic concerns, and the appraisal of publications and their affect upon fraternity systems. These six, it seems to me we could accept and identify immediately as mutual concerns.

The seventh, I would suggest we need approach perhaps more gingerly. That is the sticky business of relationships. This is always a sticky wicket. There are inherent jealousies for those things we have created. A poor thing, but mine own. That type of attitude is prevalent for all organizations, and organizational jealousies are difficult. So I would suggest a very gingerly approach to the business of relationships.

The fraternities for years have maintained that ours is a partnership. I have not heard the same enthusiasm for this relationship voiced on the other side of the fence, but the fraternities have sought stoutly to identify with institutions as partners.

I will not deal with the question of whether co-equal partners, or how much of the take belongs to each in this partnership, but a partnership, as we all know, is an extremely difficult, tricky sort of a relationship. And if it be that, we could identify as hazards in this partnership, however precarious it might be, these things which Roland developed so ably in this paper.

The handicap of changing personnel -- as you view the fraternal scene and you see the change in faces here, similarly do the fraternities view the student personnel scene and say, "I wonder why we can't find the same face two years or three years hand running?" Particularly as our institutions burgeon in size and complexity, we would recognize immediately that complexity in our own structure is a handicap to us as well as to the institutions.

Actually, after my sojourn in the Valhalla of Mr. Jefferson down there, it took me about three years to find

out after having left the deans' ranks what all these letters meant. I am a slow learner, an 82 I.Q. It takes awhile for some of us to grasp these relationships. I believe there is an aura of mystery, even though I find it difficult to believe it cannot be dispelled. Changing personnel, complexity, and a certain aura of mystery associated with a nostalgic past in which tradition and early origins perhaps gave rise to the idea that secrecy was something to be cherished. These things are handicaps.

But we can agree on one point, I think certainly from the paper, that there is not only dissatisfaction in the ranks of the deans, but in the ranks of the fraternities. One of the healthiest assets we have is that there is no smug satisfaction with the status quo.

Certainly, if I may speak without authorization for the Fraternity Secretaries, I see no sign of any such satisfaction in our ranks.

If change is inevitable, we have the choice. The choice is force, and we often resort to it, necessarily, but somewhat reluctantly, I think, because it is embarrassing for institutions, which claim to exist solely on the premise that we move the world by education, to pick up the big stick. Most of us are reluctant to use force.

We have the choice between force and education to achieve these changes. There will be no great agreement, I would suggest, as to what, and in what amount, force need be applied. There is some general agreement that force is occasionally necessary for change, and to achieve this change I suspect we can find in the premise of this fine byproduct of two or three years of thought and effort, a general agreement that what is sought is what might be termed an oasis within the university, the fraternity chapter, and not our unfortunately traditional role of a refuge from the university.

If we are seeking an oasis within, we can at least start with that, and it seems to me that these relationships are to expand the zone of acceptance.

Those things upon which we should agree, and can agree without equivocation should be the basis for an enlargement of the points on which we agree. And we must expand that zone.

It seems to me clear from this paper that most of us would agree immediately that the crucial issue overriding all of these beautifully delineated subordinate issues is the crucial issue of how can we best prepare (in terms of professional adequacy and depth) our people for their mission? How may we best prepare the right people for the job?

There are fraternity professionals being prepared. We must undertake them as individuals within our staffs. There are fraternity volunteers to be prepared, and not every volunteer, like not every professional, is an asset. Some may be a liability. We must prepare campus professionals. This is your concern. These men whom you employ to be IFC advisers and counselors are your concern. To what central source may you look for the best of the fraternity experience in the preparation of that IFC adviser for his post? And how may we best prepare those who carry our hopes? Is the influential Inter-Fraternity Council for a day and a half at Cincinnati enough? Is ACFSA-sponsored two-day session to prepare the man who will work in the field for national fraternities enough?

Is it not our job, then, to direct our collective resources in a partnership as a way to the task which brings us all together, which is education? (Applause)

CHAIRMAN NESTER: Thank you, Dick, and my fine colleagues on the panel, for your excellent presentations. As you can see, each of these men is capable of a speech in himself -- as are each of you in the audience -- on this subject.

Since this room is not in use, we will continue as long as your interest is sustained. May we have questions or comments from the floor?

DEAN WILLIAM L. SWARTZBAUGH (Associate Dean of the College, Amherst College): It seems that on some of our campuses fraternities remain strong and the Deans remain strong because of the heresies which they have sometimes been willing to commit in opposition to the IFC, the National IFC or their own national headquarters.

What I am asking at this point is what can any of you suggest as the necessary heresies of the next decade? In what ways can fraternities which are interested in close identity with the educational purposes of their institutions really remain strong and do things which are specifically relevant to the underlying objectives of the institutions?

I am thinking of the obvious situations in which colleges -- meaning their fraternity men, alumni, faculty and trustees -- are always exploring ways to provide more effectively for the residential life of their students.

I think it is understood what some of the heresies are which many colleges have had to commit on their own campuses with regard to selected membership, rushing and other things.

CHAIRMAN NESTER: You are seeking some specifics? Any suggestions and guidelines.

DEAN PATZER: I have found one of the techniques to bring people together to analyze and look at situations fairly squarely is this technique of using research not only to find out what the problem is, but to bring the forces together to do it.

To me, this was very fascinating in terms of Vermont. I am not saying we are an example, because we have a long way to go, but the fact is we were able to bring the Inter-Fraternity Council to undergraduates, we were able to bring the alumni together, the social scientists together, to work together in analyzing attitudes and see what then we could do in changing them, and actually I suspect that the end result is going to be less meaningful than the fact we brought these people together and have begun to effect some change.

I am not suggesting this is the only technique. I am sure there are others. This is one technique we tried.

... Discussion continued ...

SEMINAR
"Freedom of the Student Press"
Monday - April 5, 1965

The seminar on "Freedom of the Student Press" convened in the Annapolis Room at two o'clock, William B. Crafts, Dean of Men, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CRAFTS: I wish to welcome you to our session this afternoon, which is on the topic "Freedom of the Student Press."

... Announcement regarding registration ...

CHAIRMAN CRAFTS: Many of us this afternoon welcome a chance to hear the comments of Dr. Kreuzer, our speaker, who is well fortified to attack the problem at hand, the subject that we are to address ourselves to this afternoon. This matter may be one of the more intricate aspects of this very large, significant area of student freedom. Perhaps it is as thorny as any aspect of the large, significant problem.

Dr. Kreuzer comes to us today from Queens College of the City University of New York, where his career in teaching-administration has spanned almost three decades.

He is a graduate of the City College, with his Bachelor's from that institution, MS in education a little bit later, his Ph.D in English language and literature from New York University in 1946.

Dr. Kreuzer has certainly moved through the various academic ranks that would be at Queens College. When looking at his credits I note that he started to tutor in English, moved up through the ranks of instructor, assistant professor of English, associate, and then full professor, which he became in 1963. Various administrative duties have been attacked in more recent years by our speaker, and at the present time he is employed at Queens College as Associate Dean of Students.

His publications are numerous, too numerous to mention, but it certainly is impressive for me, in introducing him, to look at the vast number of important books and articles that he has contributed in his field of English.

He is also a member of various learned societies, as well as being a member of our Association.

Dr. Kreuzer will speak briefly and then we will open the floor for your comments and your questions. We do not have a discussant, per se, anyone who is to give his comments upon the speech, but we will look for you, the audience, to contribute your thoughts and your questions as you see fit upon the conclusion of his remarks.

So it is my privilege, and I know it will be your privilege to hear this man speak, for me to introduce to you Dr. James Kreuzer, Associate Dean of Students of Queens College. (Applause)

DEAN JAMES R. KREUZER (Associate Dean of Students, Queens College, Flushing, New York): I thank you for the introduction. I am glad you did not mention when it was I started as a tutor so everybody could figure out how long it took me to make full professor.

I would like to compliment this audience on its discernment, on its taste, on its discrimination. You have the opportunity this hour of listening to a college president, but you chose to come and listen to a dean, and I think this shows exceptionally good judgment. (Laughter)

I would like to say just a word about my role here today as I see it. I am not a speaker delivering a prepared address which I have already submitted for publication in a learned journal and which has been accepted.

Originally I was asked -- as a matter of fact, I got a letter which was a copy of a letter to somebody else, indicating that I was going to conduct a seminar. This was the first I heard of this program.

There is a kind of secrecy I have noticed over the years about NASPA programs. I do not know whether this is because the program committee is afraid that if it releases the program in advance nobody will come, or whether it thinks we function better if we are notified at the last minute about what we are to do.

I am going to continue the idea of conducting a seminar, which I would define as enunciating or setting forth a number of statements with which everybody in the room can disagree, and then everybody can disagree with everybody else.

I am not going to limit myself to the reported findings of Commission VIII. I think that you have all had copies of the report. You heard it adequately summarized and commented on this morning. There will be more discussion of it this evening.

I would like, instead, to see if I cannot put forward for your attention a number of what seem to me to be basic considerations in the area of the freedom of the student press. I make no pretense that these ideas are original, that they have not been said before, and I am sure they will be said again.

My frame of reference is the college newspaper that is supported, at least in part, by the college or university

which it serves, a college paper addressed primarily to a campus population, rather than a daily which is independently produced and perhaps addressed to the community beyond the institution.

I realize that institutions vary tremendously in the type of student press each has, but I am thinking now of the weekly addressed to a campus audience.

The first point I would like to make is that I think there are significant differences between the collegiate press and the public press, and I think these are differences which are too often forgotten, particularly on the campus. Just to name a few, the collegiate press is normally a subsidized press. It is subsidized in one way or another, either from budgetary funds allocated to it by the institution, or by the purchase of the paper by what amounts to a kind of captive audience. People have to have the paper because they must know what is going on on campus.

Secondly, the collegiate press has its focus in most places, I think, today on institutional news and institutional issues. I come from a campus in which our student editorial board has already had its say in at least two editorials that I can think of about Vietnam. But on the whole, the newspaper is focused on the institution and its news and its issues.

Another difference, I think, is that the collegiate paper is limited in size. This may be a result of budgetary limitations, it may be a result of the quantity of news and information available, but it usually is not the size of the public press.

Similarly, it is limited in the quantity of advertising it may include, and in many institutions, in the nature of the advertising it may include.

Still another difference is the fact that the collegiate press has an identifiable, clearly identifiable, primary audience. Now, the public press has to a certain extent, but I think that the secondary audience of the public press is much more difficult to define. The primary audience of the collegiate press is, of course, the campus community.

Another difference is that the collegiate press is limited in its source of staff talent. A metropolitan press can draw on the country at large, if it wishes to, or on the world, to recruit staff members. The collegiate press is normally limited to the members of its current student body.

The collegiate press also may have the obligation, it may have no say in whether it accepts this obligation or not, of being a disseminator of information to the campus at large. This may be done in a variety of ways. The adminis-

tration may, for example, buy a page of the paper, or it may demand a page, for that matter, and insist that its notices be reproduced.

Finally, the collegiate paper and its production ought to be a part of the total educational mission of the institution. It seems to me that this is perhaps the most significant difference between the collegiate press and the public press.

There are, of course, many other differences, but the point I would like to stress is that we are dealing, when we deal with the collegiate press, with a unique, with a special form of the press, which means to me that not everything that may be said about the public press is necessarily applicable to the collegiate press.

Now I will jump -- and this is why this is not a paper, it does not have the coherence of one -- to the institution of higher learning which again, it seems to me, is not the same as the society beyond it. It is not a microcosm of the society beyond it. It is a unique institution within the society. I know of no other institution in the history of man that in any way detracts from the essential uniqueness of the institution of higher learning. It is unique within the society, and it is both dependent upon that society and independent of it.

Now I suppose the only advantage of being a "speaker" as I am listed in the printed program, is that I can make such a statement and it will be another few minutes before I give you the floor to rebut it.

My statement that the institution is both dependent upon the society in which it finds itself, and independent of that society, is anomalous, perhaps, or paradoxical, or even ambiguous. But I think that it is nevertheless a valid statement.

Its major functions are to preserve, to advance, and to disseminate knowledge. And when I say this, I have to raise the question in my own mind -- and I hope in yours-- what does this do to the function of the student personnel worker, because I am not talking now about developing the whole man or anything of the kind. I think the major functions of the institution are to preserve, to advance, and to disseminate knowledge.

To do so, to meet its functions, it must have the maximum freedom which is consonant with the protection of its own integrity and its own identity. It can have only as much freedom as the society within which it operates has for itself. I think if we want to argue later, this is one of the points we might argue about. I think the institution can have only as much freedom as its society has.

Again jumping, but I think these things may come together -- the public press does not have absolute freedom. It is subject, as you well know, to the laws of libel. It cannot say anything it wants to. It is subject to the canons of good taste. As you know, the New York Times prints daily in the upper lefthand corner the motto "All the news that is fit to print." There is much news that in the opinion of the Times is not fit to print.

The public press is subject to community pressures, they may be subtle, they may be obvious, they may be powerful, they may be weak. It is subject to pressure from advertisers, for example. And it is even subject to the pressures which the corporation which it is places upon it.

I would say about the public press that it has as much freedom as the society it depends on permits it to have; and it has as much as it gives itself while preserving its own identity or existence. About it, I would make the same statement: It can be only as free as the society which supports it.

Then the collegiate press -- and I think you can see what my conclusions will be -- it is as free as the institution is and as the institution allows it to be.

I would insist that the freedom of the collegiate press must be proportional to the integrity and to the understanding of the members of its editorial staff, and I emphasize integrity and understanding, particularly understanding of the nature of the academic community.

The other day in my office, I had my weekly meeting with the editor of our student newspaper, and we are on speaking terms, and I told him that I was coming here today. I told him a little bit about NASPA. I did not tell him about the secrecy of the program. I said, "Look, what should I say to these people about freedom of the press?" This was at the end of an hour, and we both had other commitments.

He looked around rather furtively, and he reached into his briefcase and he said, "Here, this will give you the other side." And he gave me what I have seen for the first time. Maybe some of you know it well. It is called "Manual for Student Editors." I would like to read just a little from it to indicate something of what I mean by integrity or lack of it.

The introduction to the Manual opens as follows: "The one assumption that underlies this work is that the best editor is not a martyred hero but an effective force on his campus and in the educational community." I think we can safely agree with that.

"In other words, this Manual is dedicated to the principle of Machiavellian deviousness, which will keep the

the editor in a position of offensive power rather than defensive weakness." (Laughter)

Now wouldn't you like to read this? (Laughter) Here it is. You see the battleground is completely drawn. The conception of the institution, not as an academic community, but as a power complex is all here implied in the opening two sentences of this Manual. This is called "Manual for Student Editors," by Dean M. Gotera, and I am assured that Dean is his first name and not his title. (Laughter) U. S. Student Press Association. And I learned from the introduction that evidently Mr. Gotera has been the editor of the Tulane "Hullabaloo," which I do not know. If there is anybody here from Tulane you can shoot me. (Laughter)

Now if you will bear with me, I think it will be worth your while to listen to just another brief section. Chapter 3 is called -- you will be interested in knowing -- "Relations with the Administration." (Laughter)

"Editors that assume their posts at the end of the semester usually find that the first persons they must deal with are members of the university administration. Often this circumstance is a result of an invitation from the president of the university and the dean of students, or the appropriate official in the university bureaucracy who deals with campus publications for the administration, to a dinner or festive occasion." (Laughter) "In very simple terms, this occasion is often an attempted buy-off." (Laughter) "Whether conscious or unconscious, the administrators have learned the system of the bureaucracy, and have toned it to the point where they can absorb most any dissident -- faculty, staff or student. The first step in this process is to bring the student editor into the university establishment in somewhat the same way as the student government leaders on many campuses are absorbed into the same establishment."

I skip because he then rambles off on other things but then he comes back to this first meeting, this "festive occasion." He says:

"At this meeting several courses of action are available. The first is to totally alienate the administration by either refusing to attend, or by attending and then attacking. The second is to attend and mislead the administration into believing that they have the editor in the bag." (Laughter) "The third possibility is to attend and stay on the fence, neither committing to the administration nor attacking it. It is difficult to judge which of these alternatives is the best, since the solution depends on the situation at each university."

I am not reading the typos, by the way.

"It is easy to rule out the first alternative. Refusing to attend or attending and alienating will gain absolutely nothing in terms of getting and keeping the upper hand. This is immediately a declaration of war, and will serve to awaken the sleeping beast that inhabits the halls of ivy, known as the wrath of the administration."

Now, as a professor of English, I must say that is pretty nauseating. (Laughter)

"Unnecessary boat rocking is a mistake that is all too often made by editors that have not viewed the problems in the long-run terms. Making the administration mad at the editor personally will only serve to make them bear down upon his functions as editor. At this point, either the end of the year preceding editorship, or the first of the year, alienation of administration affection can be a fatal disease.

"The second alternative of action" -- this is, as you remember, attending and misleading the administration into believing they have the editor in the bag -- "The second alternative of action is designed for the editor who believes, even if he is not sure, that the administration is Machiavellian. This course buries the editor in a bed of rose petals. The administration believes that it will have no problem child on its hands, and will therefore not be looking for any problems. For the moment the editor has the upper hand in this situation. He can build up his following for the moment of attack. In essence, he has created a decoy that will distract the administration into believing that it should not insert thorns into the bed of roses the editor resides in."

So you have to breed thornless roses.

"This position is one of strength, since it leaves the initiative with the editor. Action against the editor would be unthinkable from the administration's viewpoint. The editor is free to plot his strategy for the future without the hampering effects of administrative disfavor.

"The third alternative is for the editor who feels the administration is really dealing square with him, and thus deals forthrightly with them. This position, however, is a weaker one than the second one. Here the initiative is divided. If the editor launches his attack without shoring up his support, and without taking the administration by total surprise, he could find himself in a position very difficult to defend, and very difficult for which to obtain support."

The final sentence:

"Generalizing, the best position to take with the administration is the second. This is not a universal truth

but must be decided by every editor, according to the conditions faced on his own campus."

Now I submit that if this were to represent -- and I make no claim that it does -- if this were to represent the student press as an establishment, if this kind of lack of any faith in the integrity of the people with whom you are dealing is typical of the student press, then it seems to me the freedom of the student press is in the greatest possible danger.

I read this as simply the statements of a single editor. I have no reason to believe that this has been adopted by the United States Student Press Association, which is, I am told, an organization that founded itself at the NSA convention about three years ago, and which I gather has been having its difficulties with NSA ever since.

But I think this documents my statement that the collegiate press has a freedom which is proportional to the integrity and to the understanding of the members of the editorial board.

I was interested this morning in hearing the president of NSA talk about the educational mission of the institution -- words which I am about to use, and which I shall use -- as meaning we are bowing to pressure. Now, if they are used that way, then he has a point. Somebody is not being honest with somebody. But if we are talking about the educational mission of the institution, and we mean just that, it seems to me we are making a meaningful statement.

The freedom of the collegiate press may be curtailed, may have to be curtailed when the paper ceases to serve to be a part of the primary educational mission of the institution, not when it is seeking to duck pressures applied from outside.

My editor -- I will refer to him once more -- said to me recently, "I am concerned about any limitation that may be placed upon my freedom as editor of the college paper on the paper itself." He said, "When would you place a limitation on our freedom?" I said, "Well, you tell me." He said, "Well, suppose we turned into a hate sheet, a malicious, vindictive, factually inaccurate hate sheet." He said, "What would you do?"

I said, "I refuse to answer an ify question. Show me an issue. You know, bring me in a few issues."

He said, "Yes, but you would be right, I suppose, sooner or later in doing something about it, but when would it be right?"

The only way I think I can answer that question

is in a statement I have just made: When the paper ceases to be part of the total educational mission of the institution, and it seems to me a hate sheet, as he said it, is not part of the educational mission. Freedom may have to be curtailed when it endangers the integrity or the existence of the institution.

Now I would like to stop with the two crucial questions, it seems to me, at least within the framework within which I have been speaking: Who is to determine these "whens"? That is, when does the paper cease to be part of the mission? When does the paper endanger the integrity or the existence of the institution? And how are these whens to be determined? Is it the first article, or the fourth, or the eighth?

Finally, how is the institution to exercise its educational function in relation to the newspaper? As I said earlier, I think that the institution has an obligation to the newspaper to see that education is going on as the newspaper is being produced.

I thank you for your patience, and I shall sit here and be a sitting target. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN CRAFTS: Thank you very much, Dr. Kreuzer, for a very interesting and enlightening treatise on the other side of the coin, the other side of the responsibility coin. As you read from this Manual, I think we perhaps could view some people that we have known previously who might have read from this manual, read it avidly, were impressed and influenced by it. We trust, however, it is not an official statement of this organization. We trust, however, that the actual weakness in it would show clearly through for any new student editor who would assume the reins of the paper.

Now, are there any comments or questions that you have for the speaker?

... Discussion from the floor ensued ...

SEMINAR
"Professional Preparation for
Student Personnel Service"
Monday - April 5, 1965

The seminar convened in the Frederick Room at two o'clock, Richard F. Gross, Dean of Students, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, presiding.

... Announcement regarding registration ...

CHAIRMAN GROSS: This is the seminar on "Professional Preparation for Student Personnel Service." If you are not in the place you intended to be, we will not be offended if you get up and leave now, so long as you do so in thirty seconds. If you do it after that, I am not so sure whether we will be offended or not.

I am not quite sure of the role a moderator ought to assume. In thinking of that, I am reminded of the preacher who assumed a series of one year pastorates. It seems that he would go to a church, and it would become obvious within a year that the congregation was unhappy with him, and he would move on to the next church. This went on for five one-year pastorates. Finally he was at a church for three years and people seemed to like him.

Finally he got enough courage to ask the Chairman of the Board of Deacons, "What really gives here? I think you know the history. I have had one-year pastorates. Now you seem to be happy with me, and I have been here three years."

The Board of Deacons Chairman was rather forthright and said, "Well, really, we didn't want a pastor. We didn't think we needed one; and you're the closest we could get to it." (Laughter)

I am not so sure you need a moderator of a panel, particularly with the participants we have today. I think we have an interesting topic. Professional preparation seems to be a hot issue, particularly in light of the recent formulation of a statement by the Commission on Professional Development of COSPA. So I hope that we have an interesting discussion. I am sure that we will.

I noticed in the program that we have two presenters and two reactors. I think in previous NASPA program listings the reactors were listed as "discussants." I do not know what the indication of the change from discussants to reactors means. Maybe it is a more militant or volatile aspect of our organization. I do not know. At least we are anticipating a good discussion.

I will introduce the participants, and they will

follow in order of my introduction. After they have completed their presentations, we will open the floor for questions.

Dr. Miriam Sheldon, Dean of Women of the University of Illinois, also a distinguished member of the COSPA commission on professional development.

Dr. Robert Stripling, Professor, Department of Personnel Services, University of Florida.

Dr. Glen Nygreen, Dean of Students, Hunter College in the Bronx, and also President-Designate of NASPA.

Dr. Robert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami of Ohio, Vice President of NASPA.

DEAN MIRIAM SHELDEN (Dean of Women, University of Illinois, Urbana): Dr. Gross, Fellow Panelists, NASPA members -- as am I, I discovered, as a member of Fred Turner's staff at the University of Illinois. I also am acutely aware, as I look at this audience, of how it feels to be a member of a minority. (Laughter)

I am aware of the historic moment of this occasion and am deeply honored, because I understand women speakers have been few in your history. I confess that in looking forward to my speech, I considered whether Dick Gross would arrange the order of presentation alphabetically, or whether the lady would get the first word. Then I realized that whichever choice he made I would be first, unless he resorted to great informality and used Bob and Miriam. After lunch, I am sure he has arrived at that informality, but I notice that he very carefully said "Dr. Sheldon," preserving the alphabetical order. Perhaps though, he will give me a chance to be first and last, since I understand that ladies often get the last word also.

I begin by stating basic assumptions underlying my views concerning the preparation of student personnel workers. It seems to me difficult to launch into a program without setting the base.

First, student personnel work is a profession. While it encompasses several job areas, and varying levels of responsibility, it has a central focus on the student, and on his out-of-class life.

Secondly, it is a component of higher education, and the student personnel worker is an informal and sometimes formal teacher. His work is complementary to the academic classroom experience. As faculty give less time and attention to individual students in the press of expanding enrollments, due also to heightened faculty participation in off-campus consultation, research, writing, and

with increasing specialization in the faculty members' field, the faculty, by default, may delegate to the student personnel worker an additional responsibility to assume an important role in the liberal education of the student. That is helping to synthesize the student's fragmented learning.

We would accept that responsibility, for it is in line with our traditional concern for the whole student. Student personnel work reinforces the basic educational concept of individual differences, and complements the general education of the student.

Thirdly, student personnel work demands professional preparation. As the complexity of a college or university increases, as its service functions expand, as specialties develop within the field, professional preparation is needed for effective work with students. Faculty may no longer know either the students or the institution -- nothing beyond his own area of a single discipline. Middle level administrators are often hired, knowing chiefly techniques of management. Apprentice training is wasteful of time, of both the dean and of his student or new staff apprentice. "How" to do it is learned without concepts of "why." Theoretical concepts are inadequately transmitted to the neophyte. The body of knowledge expands and needs drawing together in teachable units.

Fourthly, student personnel work is an applied science, drawing on basic disciplines for fundamental concepts, but has its own body of knowledge. It is researchable and has a code of ethics, though often not clearly articulated.

On these assumptions, I then proceed to examine career patterns and points of entry.

Historically, many persons from the faculty simply transferred their concerns for students and their teaching from the formal classroom to an informal setting, often continuing to teach part time. Some still will enter the field from this pattern.

With the advent of electives, academic advising was a natural role for faculty to assume, for who else knew what the courses contained? Now it takes a specialist to even read a college catalog.

With the entry of women in higher education, and especially into co-ed institutions, faculty women were assigned as prefects or wardens to guard the health of young women. Incidentally, if I read the histories of the periods correctly, there were greater fears that college women would lead young men into paths of wickedness, than concern for the morals of the young women who dared to enter these precincts long sacred to men. The women apparently were already lost souls.

As the behavioral sciences advanced, as Freudian concepts prevailed, and as psychological testing after World War I came to the colleges, people trained in these disciplines applied their findings to work with students. Thus, psychology and its applied science offshoot, counseling, became the base for many programs. A little earlier, programs broadly based and work oriented developed to prepare people for direct entry into the emerging professional jobs.

Notable among these programs was that developed at Teachers College, Columbia. Women particularly found its Master's program well designed to prepare them for the emerging job of Deans of Women, though many continued to be appointed from the faculty, as were men to similar positions.

As the body of knowledge expanded, Doctoral programs developed in this field comparable to those in other applied fields, for example, engineering. Today, careers begin in residence halls, in student unions, in admission offices, in deans' offices. Young college graduates, "older" (no woman is "old") women re-entering professional work after the biological interlude, or men starting a late or second career after military, enter Master degree programs to prepare for professional level work in student personnel.

Most of these programs include a supervised practicum, or internship, and require two years. Qualifications at point of entry include a Bachelor's degree, preferably with some foundation in the social sciences, suitable personal characteristics, and some experience as a student in activities or residential living, or comparable community experience.

A model program of professional preparation would include, in my opinion, the following elements:

1. Study of the college student, including his nature, needs, and human development. Hopefully, some attention would be paid to the differing life patterns of men and women.
2. The study of colleges and universities as social institutions, including their history and objectives.
3. A survey of student personnel work in higher education, including an over-view of the various services and functions, and perhaps even more important, an exploration of social and legal issues, of concepts of discipline, of authority, and freedom, of social change, conflict, and similar topics.
4. Principles and techniques of counseling, group dynamics, and human relations, and communications.
5. Principles and techniques of administration

and decision making, including theory of organization and fiscal management, selection and in-service training of staff, and institutional relationships.

6. Supervised practicum, internship or field work, with accompanying seminar. The assignment of this phase of training would be tailored to the individual needs of the graduate students. It would include both working with individuals and with groups.

7. Research, evaluation and independent study. If advances in the profession are to be made, tools for research and evaluation must be included in graduate study, though not necessarily extensively at the Master's level.

While I have drawn heavily on the COSPA first report, my model has common elements with a proposal drawn up by Esther Lloyd Jones for consideration of an inter-divisional committee of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. No attempt has been made to treat the preparation of specialties in the field.

For example, a present day admission officer will need computer science and data processing, as well as the areas shown.

Nor have I attempted to show job clusters. For example, a beginner could well work in student activities, a residential hall, or financial aid, or in a dean's office, before progressing to higher levels of responsibility in any one of those fields. With little adjustment of his preparation, he could begin work in foreign student advising, particularly if his undergraduate work had been in an allied discipline, such as cultural anthropology, international relations, or foreign languages. Probably such a Master's degree would come under a college of education, although a very exciting inter-disciplinary program could be developed.

For those wishing to, further study would be specialized to give greater concentration in a single field. For broad administrative positions, such as the Dean of Students, a Vice President of Student Affairs, a Director of Foreign Student Affairs, a Director of Housing or of Admissions, a Doctor's degree would be necessary. Hopefully, some persons would be attracted to research and teaching also.

The model I have proposed has three basic fields: Foundation in the social sciences, theory and techniques in methods, and knowledge and practice in the work field.

In my opinion, most people initially entering the field of college student personnel work should have the basic preparation I have described. Presently offered programs need better balance. Some have relied heavily on psychology and counseling in a one-to-one relationship. Others have

stressed administrative techniques at the expense of theoretical bases in human development and social foundations. Most have not explored sufficiently sociology's and anthropology's contributions to an understanding of students or of the social institution of higher education.

The whole profession suffers from the affects of shortages of professional staff. Today the employer-dean is about like an army looking at a draftee. If it is warm, it is hired.

So I urge that as a profession we unite to recruit young people to enter the profession, that we continuously strive to upgrade the skills of persons now in the field, and that we lend our support to institutions as they develop programs of professional preparation at both the Master's and the Doctor's levels.

I further urge that deans and vice presidents cooperate with departments offering graduate work, assisting wherever possible by teaching or in supervision of practicum and internship experience of students in training; that they institute cooperative research programs with these graduate departments; and that they convey to presidents, federal agencies and regional groups the urgent need of our profession.

If we do not do so, I predict that we will become a new generation of domestic service workers, housekeepers, and custodians, and that a future speaker at this Conference will talk simply about preparation for college service. Perhaps by then, however, we would be only a union, not a profession. Maybe we will be joining the ones with the fancy tags.

Let us come of age as a profession and adequately prepare young people for induction into college student personnel work. Thank you. (Applause)

DR. ROBERT STRIPLING (Department of Personnel Services, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida): I agree so very much with the remarks that Miriam has made, and perhaps much of what I will say will be very much like what she said. I think that I might put it in a different context and in a different setting, and I think this is important because we need to be sure that we talk about different ways of approaching this problem.

As you know, NASPA, ACPA (one of the divisions of APGA), and COSPA have taken leadership in developing statements about counsel education, student personnel work, and these have all been very helpful. I think we realize too that the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision is very concerned about this area, a group that represents the people who are primarily teaching in the area of student

personnel work in institutions of higher learning.

I say this not to create a dichotomy here, but rather to recognize different responsibilities and to re-emphasize Miriam's plea that those who have the primary responsibility in services in the institution, and those who have the primary responsibility in teaching in an institution work more closely together. I cannot accept this concept of the theorist and the practitioner. I think many of you who are involved heavily in "practice," so to speak, are very interested in "theory." I know that many of my associates around the country, who are your associates too, in many cases who are teaching primarily, spend much of their time also in practice of one kind or another.

So I do not see the distinction here, but I think we do recognize areas of responsibility within institutions, and we must do this, but in a cooperative way, rather than in a way that separates us.

I am going to say several specific things about preparation which seem to me, if anything, if it does anything, it simply puts in another context -- and I do not consider this a very dividing way either, in the sense that it is not separating us -- what Miriam has said.

As she indicated, I say first that student personnel work, the preparation for it, is graduate level preparation. I think we have accepted this. There has been a lot of concern about what is the undergraduate background. I suspect most of us argue that in terms of our own biases, our personal experiences. If you asked me, I might say political science, history, philosophy, literature. But I have been amazed how well those people who came from mathematics have done in student personnel work, in their undergraduate areas; and how well those from the biological sciences, or from physics have done. So I think that as I look at this, and have over a period of years, I am not concerned.

I think we are certainly concerned in a broad undergraduate preparation, but I believe that most of our institutions give us that; particularly the students who have the personal characteristics, the drive, the energy, the insights that we want in student personnel work, have gotten this to a great degree.

I think that I would say again that the program is two graduate years of preparation, the minimum program.

Many of you, likely, are members of APGA, and you know the policy statement there, that the minimum preparation for any counselor, student personnel specialist, in any setting, is a minimum of two years. So I would certainly say that.

A third point would be that a program of preparation in student personnel work in higher education is in an institution that has a strong, across-the-board program of preparation in counselor education. I think this is most important.

Student personnel specialists in higher education need to see interrelationships. They need to see a longitudinal approach to problems. I think this is very important. You know, we could learn from medical education.

Medical education decided that the reason nurses, doctors, medical technicians were not working together was because they were not having common opportunities in preparation together. This has changed the concept of medical education quite a bit. It has moved into the concept of health education, a broader field of work.

I think that the opportunities to exchange ideas with those who are primarily interested in rehabilitation counseling, or employment service work, or elementary school counseling, secondary school counseling, junior college counseling, is a very important aspect.

So I would hope that we would have programs in institutions that had been concerned about a broad arena of preparation. Also, certainly, these institutions should be those who have developed programs in higher education, some interest, some area of spacialization here.

The student personnel worker in higher education must have a sense of history, a feel of tradition, the things that have gone on before him, the things that have molded higher education as we see it in our country. So this is important.

Another point that I think that is of concern to me is our attitude toward institutions that are attempting to develop programs. I would agree here with Miriam. I think that we can no longer afford to be exclusive in our thinking. It seems to me that we have problems of helping many institutions develop their programs, develop quality in these programs.

Within the broad context of an across-the-board program in counsel education, I would see these elements involved here:

In the first place, there would be a core program that would be important to every person who is interested in student personnel work. This core program is different perhaps from the student personnel specialist, and the general college administrator, the core program that might develop. I see in that core program personality theory, human growth and development. I see a heavy emphasis on

the self theories in psychology.

Our president of this group last night reminded us of the impact of existentialism. I would agree wholeheartedly that this is an orientation that is important. Certainly the phenomenological approach to learning, to sharing experiences is important. So I would see this kind of orientation.

But the orientation in this direction, and the purpose of theory is not to develop a student of psychological theory; it is to assist the student in developing his own theoretical base from which he will work. He not only knows what to do, but he has some concept of why he does it. He can tie it to a theoretical base within his own life experiences, his own feelings, his own attitudes. So this is important.

Another part of this core, I mentioned human growth and development, and here again this is a longitudinal look at human growth and development. The college freshman of today is much more a high school student than he is a college student. I think that the significance of this is important to college student personnel specialists. I think there is opportunity to look here.

I would say another aspect of the core would be counseling theory and practice. Both theory and practice are important in this context.

Another aspect of this core of preparation would be measurement theory and statistics, programming techniques, data processing, research, and evaluation. This would be a core centered around research statistics. The objective here again is important. It is not to assist the student in becoming an authority in the field of statistics -- although I would not fight this, if this is his interest -- but more important, it is to assist him in seeing how instruments of measurement can be used in facilitating self understanding among those with whom he works. To me, this is the acid test of the use of instruments in this field: Does this test have as its primary objective the facilitation of self understanding on the part of the students? I think if we applied that test to most of the testing we are doing today we would cut out about 90 percent of our testing.

Another part of this core would be vocational development theory. Here again, this is a longitudinal approach, the vocational development theory, and the implications for a vocational development theory, the implications that we draw from it for post-college life in a rapidly changing society, a society where most of the college graduates will live in two or three parts of the world during their lifetime, so we have serious implications here.

I see these as a core group that would be common to all people working in counseling, student personnel services at any level of education, or any of our agencies of society. This would be a core.

As we develop programs, I think I would agree certainly that another aspect of this program, outside of this core, would be the institution and the student -- the institution and the student, the research on the college community, the research on the college student, the relationships between these and a dynamic college environment certainly is important.

Then I mentioned a sense of history, a feeling for what has happened in higher education, why we are at this point in our developments of higher learning today -- this whole context of a history of higher education, a curriculum, a study of the curriculum, a study of organization and administration. But you see, the institution and the student, this would be the direction of it for the person who is going toward higher education.

You could apply the same concept to the person who is going toward elementary school counseling. He needs the institution and the student too; or junior college education, he needs the institution and the student.

Another aspect of an across-the-board development in counsel education would be work in related disciplines, in sociology, in economics.

I am concerned about how we use the sociologist who comes to the student personnel staff. I am afraid that we use him in a way that makes him ineffective. I would hope we would use him as a sociologist, not as a counselor. I could elaborate on that in many cases. I think this is true. How do we use the people that we might bring in? How do they contribute? I would say the sociologist can contribute best in utilizing his own interests, his own areas, and this is the thing, in the studying of groups, in the studying of the sub-cultures on the campus, things of this nature.

A fourth aspect would be practice in individual and small group counseling. Here again, I feel that the student personnel specialist needs this kind of understanding of human relationships. He is not going to become proficient in this area to the extent perhaps that the person who is going into the counseling center would, but these kinds of dynamics of human relationships are important, if he is going to be different, and I think there is a good basis for making him different, if he is going to be different from the general college administrator, and I think there is a good argument for this.

The last aspect of a program would be an internship

in the specific area of interest to the student, with opportunities for him to study that area of interest. Internship would be in the sense of assisting this student in getting some depth of understanding, appreciation in one area of college student personnel work. I think this is important.

So this, to me, would be the model that I would present for the preparation of college student personnel specialists, which would admittedly bring them in contact with others who are interested in this total area of work, at different levels, and in different agencies.

It seems to me that what we need to do is reach broader groups, to develop a model, and then encourage many institutions to use their own individual and unique resources in implementing this model, or this goal.

Another thing we need is more discussion at the local institutional level between those who are primarily concerned with student personnel services in a service sense, against those who are primarily concerned because they teach primarily in this area. We need this kind of discussion.

There has been some talk about percentages. This is my last point. "What percentage, Stripling, would you have them in personality theory? What percentage would you have them take economics?"

Well, I do not know. I think this is slicing the pie too carefully. I do not think we can work it out. But I sense an underlying concern here, when people talk about percentages. Some are concerned that there would not be enough supervised practice, and some are concerned that there will be too much didactic instruction, or not enough, you see. So I would suggest that one way of solving this dilemma might be for us to get together and talk a good bit about the characteristic of supervised experiences. This seems to me to be a very important thing to do.

I believe some of us in counsel education, primarily, are concerned about the commitment for quality supervised practice. This is more than giving a student a desk and a chair in the office and saying, "Now you watch me." Supervised experiences -- it is a commitment of time to that student, a commitment of careful, individual type of instruction with that student, and I think that here is where we need an opportunity to talk quite a bit.

I feel that we are making tremendous progress in working through these problems, and I am going to stop at this point, and I will be interested in any comments from the audience that we get. (Applause)

DEAN GLEN NYGREEN (Dean of Students, Hunter College): I have been restricted by the Chairman to something

less than the fifty minutes I am accustomed to when I stand in front of a group in this kind of setting, and so I shall refrain from the compliments to which our two speakers are obviously entitled for their careful and thoughtful presentations, and I shall, for purposes of reacting and being a stimulator, adopt a somewhat different attitude. I assure you I am not trying to be cute in doing it. It is simply because I think, in response to these two papers, you need another point of view with which to look at this question.

I shall identify myself, first of all, as a sociologist, a man, as Time magazine once observed, "continually astounded by the obvious."

Second, I must tell you that I do some teaching in a distinguished graduate school for the preparation of guidance and student personnel workers.

Third, I must tell you that I am a Dean of Students in a Liberal Arts college.

Now, there is much here that I agree with, but I think there is some foolishness too. I think there is one basic qualification for a student personnel worker, and I could give you this in outline form if you want it, but that would take a minute or two longer than I think I ought to, so let me just succinctly say, he must be able to read. He must enjoy reading, and he must demonstrate this enjoyment by reading in preference to doing certain other things, such as watching television, playing bridge, or sleeping long hours.

Having said that, I imply that any person, if you look at these core programs about which our two speakers have very carefully delineated, I think you would have to say that much of what they talked about can be learned through a program of continued, curious investigation about the environment within which one lives and works.

I would say that the problems a student personnel administrator faces, is finding capable people to carry out the duties which are assigned to him. He employs people with an eclectic view in mind. He will employ them from whatever academic discipline they will come, assuming that there are certain motivations and interests which these people possess, and certain qualities of experience and personality which enable them to acquire the specific orientation they need on the job.

The task of professional preparation then, as distinct from what these speakers have been calling training -- and I did observe that in most cases Dr. Stripling was careful to say "counselor education" and not use the word training -- that in this situation much of what needs to be done must be provided if we are to staff our programs competently

with in-service training programs, with programs which allow for and encourage the involvement of staff in professional organization, and professional experience outside the immediate assignment on the job.

In fact, I could take my good friend Miriam Sheldon's content and tell her that if these people had a good background in sociology, psychology, mathematics, and American history, they would have had all the things that she described.

To me, the most important qualification for a student personnel person is that he must have a sense of belonging in the academic community, and what the marks of that belonging are makes relatively little difference to me. There must be an academic discipline within which he feels secure.

We are all familiar today with the thesis which Caplow and McGee, in the academic market place, made very explicit, the thesis that student personnel workers exist as a kind of academic civil service because the faculty have discovered that their probability, and consequently their achievement of that prestige which makes for rank and salary, comes about because of the status in the discipline, not because of the service to the employing institution.

It seems to me that what you have -- I think this is implicit in Ed Williamson's data, from the academic freedoms study -- that deans of students in effect are managers, they are bureaucrats, they are (and he uses this term himself in a revealing slip) agents of the president.

What I would plead for is the kind of student personnel worker who feels a point of secure identification in the academic jungle of the campus, from which he then carries out his special interest and concern in the work with students in achieving the goals our two speakers have outlined.

You would think, having heard this, that what I am talking about is talking against the professional education, professional preparation of student personnel workers. Not at all. There are simply not enough of them. There never will be enough of them. It is inconceivable during my professional lifetime, or yours, that there can be enough professionally, fully trained counselor educators, or whatever you want to call them, to fill the needed posts in our colleges and universities.

Therefore, I am pleading the point of view of the Dean of Students who is responsible for seeing that these positions are staffed, that students are served, that the interests of the academic community are advanced, and that insofar as it is possible for us to do so there is created a climate which we would agree is called community on the

campus.

If I had time I would quarrel at some length with what I thought was an unwitting readiness, over-readiness, on Miss Shelden's part to call student personnel work a profession.

In the yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, I think about 1959, there is a very interesting article by one of the leaders of our profession, Dan Fedder -- you see, even I call it a profession -- in which he raises the question if student personnel work can reasonably be called a profession, or even should be called a profession. And this confusion has reached the point wherein a distinguished sociologist, Harold Wolinski of the University of California, at Los Angeles, in a recent issue of the American Journal of Sociology, discussing perceptively this whole question of the emphasis on professionalization in our whole society, simply titles his carefully reasoned article "A Profession for Everyone."

Well, this is enough of a quick reaction. Thank you. (Applause)

DEAN ROBERT F. ETHERIDGE (Dean of Students, Miami University): I think you can see why he is our leader, and others of us are just staff men. I told Glen that it is often very difficult for the near-brilliant to follow the brilliant and to attempt to keep up with them. I feel like, being from the farm, I am used to the tail end of things. (Laughter)

I do not really know what there is left for me to say. I would just raise, I suppose, a few questions. I hardly know where to start.

I think the encouraging thing about this experience this afternoon is that there are more points of agreement, by far, than there are points of disagreement. Frankly, I am not really concerned whether I am called a professional or not, but I am really quite concerned if the students and my boss, and my colleagues, consider whether I am doing a competent job or not. There are times, I think, actually that I am doing a competent job when I am called an s.o.b. There are times when I consider I am doing a competent job when somebody says, "He's understanding."

I feel sometimes that I am competent when somebody says, "Well, the poor, stupid -- he didn't even get the point of the situation."

I am almost like the colleague of Miriam's from Illinois, quite early, Bob Zuppke, the football coach. There are really many times when I do not care what they say about me, just so long as they say it. That way they know I'm

there on the job and doing something. I have no great delusions of grandeur about whether I am a professional man or not.

Some things that I think were overlooked. We have kind of ignored here some of the elements of the human dimension. We have kind of ignored here -- it was implied, certainly, but it was almost coldly clinical -- what about these people who go into these fields, either of counselor or as an administrator, what about their personal characteristics? We have been trying for a long, long time to even understand the process of motivation.

I think we had better be concerned here -- and maybe this is romanticism of the highest order -- but I think we ought to be as much concerned about the cold clinical preparation of people, we ought to be concerned about what kind of people they are, and what kind of concerns they have for students, and (Glen implied this) what kind of concerns they have about the society in which they belong.

I do not know how you teach this, but I think these are things you must be aware of.

I would say "amen" to the statements that cooperative research and efforts are demanded. I do not know if it was said that they were demanded, but I think that they are.

I would say "amen" too that there is far too little discussion at the local level between -- and this kind of put me on edge -- between those involved in the service occupation and those who teach. I have thought that sometimes there were certain things I was teaching, because it seems to me that in the process of explanation to students this is nothing more than teaching.

I would say "amen" that one of the great things lacking is the characteristics of supervised practice. This we do not have enough of.

I think as a Dean of Students that I consider myself as a teacher, but often not of students. That I consider the concept here that Glen was advancing that my primary responsibility is in the area of in-service education, certainly with students, but very, very importantly with staff. I think that the comfort in academe, so to speak, really comes from being an ardent student of this particular phenomenon, as a rather unique and social phenomenon that has really not been explored as much as it should be. I think there is plenty of room there in understanding all of the dynamics of an institution of higher learning, to wit, instead of using Berkeley and Stanford, to wit, Yale and St. Johns. I think you have enough there in understanding a unique social process that you can become a specialist in the social institution or the social phenomenon known as

higher education. As you develop certain competencies in this area of the process, to say nothing of the disciplines involved, it seems to me that you can have comfort and academe, and you can have reasonable claim to a profession if you are so directed and want to be called a professional.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN GROSS: The floor is now open for questions. If you have a question, would you identify yourself, the institution which you represent, and if possible, direct your question to one of the panelists.

... Discussion from the floor ensued ...

SEMINAR

"Student Participation in Policy and Decision Making"

Monday - April 5, 1965

The seminar convened in the Dover Room at three-thirty o'clock, Merrill Beyerl, Vice President for Student Affairs, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, presiding.

CHAIRMAN BEYERL: The subject of this seminar is "Student Participation in Policy and Decision Making."

Since September 1, 1963, Dr. Kauffman has been on a joint appointment as Consultant to the Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education and as Director of Higher Education Services for the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

He served as an original member of the U. S. Peace Corps headquarters staff beginning in the spring of 1961 in the post of Director of Training. In this position he was responsible for the training of all Peace Corps volunteers until September, 1963.

Previous positions held by Dr. Kauffman include serving as Dean of Students and Assistant to the President at Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts, during the years 1952 through 1960. He is a consultant to both the State Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity and also serves as a visiting lecturer in education at the University of Maryland.

Dr. Kauffman has written a number of articles concerning youth and college students, including two recent articles on student personnel services in higher education

published in the summer and fall 1964 issues of the Educational Record.

He holds the B.A. degree from the University of Denver, the M.A. degree from Northwestern University, and the Ed.D. from Boston University. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the American Sociological Association and the American College Personnel Association.

On July 15, 1965, Dr. Kauffman will assume the post of Dean of Student Affairs, and Professor of Counseling and Behavioral Studies, at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

It is our privilege to present Dr. Kauffman. (Applause)

DR. JOSEPH F. KAUFFMAN (American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My friends are incredulous about that recent decision. Some of them have nervously bid me farewell, as though I were going off to the war, and I have a few psychiatrist friends who have been probing my psyche in trying to determine to what extent masochism is possessing me, and what kind of aberration this is. But I look forward to getting back to a campus and being once again a colleague in NASPA.

I just came from what I consider a rather stunning performance by Dr. Gideonse, which leaves me rather breathless in terms of what I had planned to do in making some preliminary remarks, and participating in a discussion.

I also managed to get in five minutes with Professor Van Alstyne, who is in the next room, on due process. For those of you who have not seen the new Journal of Law in transition, it has, I guess, maybe the second issue is out and I will have to find out where it comes from. I do not have it with me. But the second issue is devoted almost exclusively to an article by Professor Van Alstyne, of the Law faculty at Duke, on the rights of public universities in suspension, exclusion and dismissal of students. It is a highly provocative piece, a tremendous legal research, with all the citations one would want in terms of precedents in the law, and effectively ties the hands of any public institution from prescribing rules and regulations that automatically lead to dismissal.

So I would hope that if some of you do get a chance to talk to him or to read that article, you will discuss it and think about it, because I think it has very profound implications.

I see many old friends in the room, many people from whom I have learned, and I am somewhat embarrassed at being in the position of a resource person on the subject of

"Student Participation in Policy and Decision Making." I was told I did not have to prepare a paper nor a manuscript, but to make some preliminary remarks, and then participate or lead a discussion, and that is what I will do, with no further apologies.

Although Dean Williamson told us that we were not supposed to confine our remarks or our discussion to his Commission VIII report, I think it is of interest to point out that one of his conclusions, at least, in the summary of his report, concerns this topic, and I quote from that, "Participation in the institutional determination of desired forms of freedom and any necessary limits may indeed be the most fundamental freedom that students will enjoy."

The study goes on to point out that 77 percent of the presidents suggested that student participation is definitely helpful, and only 4 percent reported student involvement of no value.

"In general, we found that where students were participants in policy making at more significant levels, the presidents were more likely to appraise this participation as being beneficial to the university."

The conclusion, I guess, one would draw from this, or the inference, is that those presidents who allow students to participate at significant levels think it is a good idea.

This bothers me, because I do not see how else it could turn out. One thing that bothers me in the context of an open campus, that some of the schools that have had the least amount of student participation in policy making are those perhaps with the most open campus. I do not know whether this is a contradiction, an exception that proves the rule, or what. But I cannot help but think of the classical kind of institution, whether in Europe or over here, that has always allowed considerable freedom, and yet has never really involved the students in policy making, and I would include -- maybe my data are out of date, but I would include Harvard and Yale and Chicago, and Berkeley, as institutions that have always been very open, very free, very liberal and yet not particularly known for student involvement and policy making.

So it gives me some pause at least, and I would not over-simplify the interpretation of the findings in this study.

When I was asked to make these preliminary remarks, I reached for a pamphlet I had in my bookcase 'lo these many years, never knowing when it would come in handy, and that is the Harry Lunn pamphlet put out by the American Council on Education back in 1957, called "The Students' Role in

College Policy Making." This was published in 1957. The Commission on Student Personnel actually engaged Mr. Lunn in 1956. He was president of the National Student Association the year prior to that, and although the material, the data is primarily early 1950's, '52, '53, it still is of great interest, and it is about the only study I know of that attempted to go into any depth on this subject. I believe that it is still available, although I am not positive about that. I will be very glad to find out, if any of you are interested.

It seems to me our discussion can take several directions. It is my view that we ought to consider such concepts as participation versus negotiation, as one concept. I think that there is a lot of confusion in terms here.

Is negotiation between administration and student government a form of participation in policy making, or do we mean by participation a kind of dialog, a kind of equality in the context of policy making which does not have two particular sides at loggerheads, and some kind of arbitration going on, negotiation going on to reach some compromise.

It would be my own view that when we talk about participation in policy and decision making that we ought to be clear as to whether or not we are talking about participation as something distinctly separate from negotiation, which many of us are forced into, and I think has a quite different context.

A second aspect that concerns me and always has is the inherent difficulty of some members of a policy committee, a decision making body, viewing themselves as representatives of a constituency, while other participants may only feel the need to consider the merits of the particular issue being discussed.

This is easily observable, I would submit, in a committee in which members of the faculty have been appointed, perhaps by a faculty senate, perhaps by a dean, perhaps by the president or provost, but who view themselves as individuals asked to participate in a discussion or deliberation about some policy matter, where other members of the committee, to a certain extent, administrators may feel somewhat compromised in this, in that they are speaking for the president's office or the trustees, or the administration.

On the other extreme, the students, if they view themselves as representatives of student government, unable to participate as individuals, but having a position which they must put forth, a mandate in terms of the way in which they must vote, feel a need to defend themselves before their constituents if they wish to change their mind because

of the persuasive arguments or new facts which arose in such participation. I think we have a built-in problem, a built-in inequality, and I think that this is one of the aspects I would hope that those of you with more experience can enlighten us. It seems to me to be a serious difficulty.

A third one -- and I will not list any more -- is the political aspect of student government, and the need for opposition to the status quo in order to gain political advantage.

It seems to me evident that if someone is going to run for student government office that he needs to find an issue. If a party is going to run, it needs to find an issue.

The issue is usually best found when one criticizes that which exists. It may be that those who are participating in policy making committees of the faculty and administration, representing student government, are characterized as being too cooperative, or stooges, or brainwashed, or too conservative, or what have you. If one is to gain political office, one has to criticize, regardless of the merits of the particular stands which student representatives might have taken.

So I think this is a third issue, the question of whether student participation in policy making always has to be in the frame of reference or context of a formal student government activity, whether it is possible for students to participate, as individual faculty members participate very often, without the obligation to a constituency or to a mandate somewhere else, which I think compromises participation, although it strengthens, perhaps, negotiation.

There are lots of other questions, and I am sure that you can raise as many difficulties as I can.

I am also sure that this is not an either/or question. I do not think, as we found in the study of campus freedom, that anyone takes the position that we should have no student participation in any kind of policy making, or that we should turn over all policy making of all kinds to students. It seems to me, however, that if we look at what is brewing in higher education, if we look at the mood of the campus, the mood of student government, the restlessness and so on, I see three or four areas in which a desire to participate in policy making will lead in the next few years, and if they are not already in evidence on your campus, I predict they will be shortly.

The first of these is the area of the integrity of the teaching function of the undergraduate students -- the effectiveness of teaching, including the evaluation of teaching. I think this is an area which on some campuses

already is an issue, and in some it has been almost institutionalized in committees. In others it will be a big battle. But I have been very impressed with some of the things I have seen or read about some committees, at least -- if there is anyone here from UCLA, I would like to have them comment, or from the University of Washington.

I did see the Chancellor's Committee on Academic Policy from UCLA, a report which I thought was superior, which called for a number of recommendations involving changes in the curriculum, in general education, in course load, in means of aiding departments by providing informal and confidential evaluations of student opinion on some of the required courses, and the ways in which they were taught; and most interesting to me, a recommendation for the way in which student graduate teaching assistants could be utilized more effectively and more properly on the campus. In this area they called for a four-year fellowship program for graduate students who were going to be teaching assistants, so that the first year the student would be allowed to work full time on his graduate study, to carve out what he wanted to do, and the problems he was interested in, and devote himself full time on fellowship; and in his second and third year would be a teaching assistant but would cut down somewhat on his course load and would be involved in seminars, and in evaluation and supervision of his teaching; and in his fourth year, still on the fellowship stipend, would be relieved of any further teaching so that he could complete his degree program in a normal kind of time.

I think this is a very helpful kind of recommendation coming from a student body, or from a student committee and I am most respectful of that. They did cite several times the University of Washington, which is why I mentioned that. If there is anyone familiar with their program of evaluation of teaching effectiveness, I would be interested in hearing about it.

A second item -- and I am only going to mention these three briefly -- is the relevance, or the rigidity of the curriculum.

I think this is an area in which the students are going to press for participation in the educational policy committees of the faculty, at least participation in order to give their voice to some of the questions about the need for revision in the curriculum. I think there are many students who feel very strongly -- many faculty too -- many of the burning issues of the day that strike a strong response in students and on campuses have no way of being fed into the curriculum, because they cut across all lines and they are nobody's business, they do not fit neatly into any department, and so on.

Issues of peace and war, and racial justice, and so on, are burning issues among many students today, and there is really very little opportunity for this to be related to the curriculum as it now stands, and I think we will see a lot of pressure for either credit or non-credit kinds of intellectual activity, academic offerings, which relate to some of these burning issues.

The third and final item on this -- and these are the three most controversial, you will note -- has to do with promotion and tenure. I would assume that this will be the last wall that will be scaled. I am not even sure about my own feelings on it. I have defended the position of the faculty at times, at not having any student participation whatsoever in questions having to do with faculty promotion and tenure.

On the other hand, there are some of my colleagues who do not feel that strongly about, and again, if there are any people here with this experience, I hope they will share it. If there are any student leaders here, I hope they will share with us their point of view on this.

In summary, I would say that students, more and more, are concerned with the quality and the integrity of the education they are getting, and this is the area in which I think we will see movement about student participation, not so much in rules and regulations in residence halls and so on. I think that battle is pretty well over, and if it is not, it does not really engage the same kind of interest as some of these more profound issues.

I think a variety of means of communication, of dialog are necessary. I think that the challenge to student personnel work and student personnel services is very great indeed, for I am troubled at our inability in fine professional student personnel services to relate to the new mood that one can see on the campus, to relate to some of the concerns of the students.

I think we can find campuses with superb professional student personnel programs, ripped apart with strife and difficulty, and no real way for the professional persons and the kind of conventional organization of those services to be relevant or responsive to these new problems on the campus.

I think we have to find very many new ways of creating communication with students and certainly their participation in policy making is one.

I think that student discontent is going to grow, and I think will spill over in ways that demand our attention, and I hope that we can find some way to deal with it in some constructive and rewarding way.

I would be very happy to try to answer questions. Again, I do not pose as an expert on this. I would much prefer hearing some illustrations, and I think it would be most productive for others here, hearing some illustrative material here, pro and con, from some of you who are involved.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN BEYERL: Thank you, Dr. Kauffman.

Are there some contributions, questions?

... Discussion from the floor ensued ...

SEMINAR

"Legal Due Process and Student Rights"

Monday - April 5, 1965

The seminar convened in the Richmond Room at three-thirty o'clock, Thomas J. Edwards, Dean of Students, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, presiding.

CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: Many of you can remember not too many years ago when a seminar was announced and held in NASPA, that one would take hold of the chairs and gather in a semi-circle and have what seemed to be a rather informal discussion. After observing the seminars in this Conference, those days are passed, so perhaps we have moved, as Dr. Gideonse said in the last seminar, away from more of the colonial education forms to that of the German, where they had 800 students in their seminars.

After I accepted O. D. Roberts' request to Chair this seminar, I wondered exactly what the role of a Chairman might be. I probed a little bit, and it didn't take very long after seeing the speaker, Professor William Van Alstyne, the topic of "Legal Due Process and Student Rights," and the time being about an hour and a half, to know that the role of the Chairman is to make a concise introduction, and then punt, in deans' language.

I think when one attends a seminar, we sometimes wonder if the speaker is chosen for the topic, or the topic sometimes chosen for the speaker. I think this afternoon we have a wonderful example of a perfect blend. It is not by accident that Professor Van Alstyne is with us. It was through Dean Williamson and O. D. Roberts that he was sought out and chosen because of his interest and his writings along this particular topic.

I think that this would certainly be a supplement to our program, as it has fit in with the Commission VIII study, and would be an enrichment of the fact that we have with us, and speaking, a person who not only represents the legal profession, but also has a keen and probing interest into this whole topic of student freedom.

To illustrate, Professor Van Alstyne is currently serving as a member of the American Association of University Professors Committee S, which is concerned with academic freedom. He also has written several articles that I would briefly like to mention.

He has written on a topic, "Discrimination in State University Housing Programs" published in the Stanford Law Review. He also has written on "Political Speakers at State Universities," which has appeared in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, followed by the "Procedural Due Process and State University Students." Most recently his article appeared in the Law in Transition Quarterly, an article entitled "Student Academic Freedom and the Rule-Making Power of Public Universities."

I, for one, was impressed with the very scholarly and articulate approach to the topic, and I think that most certainly Dean Williamson has added something to our program. He did point out, and I want to mention, that in his last article, he had said about the review of how courts have treated, or perhaps have maltreated the student academic freedom. He also followed this with an attempt to demonstrate why the general legal tradition respecting student rights is no longer relevant. Finally, a statement of a system, or a tentative system of student academic freedom relative to the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. I would recommend this article for those who are interested.

Professor Van Alstyne is a native of California, born, we assume, not too many years ago. He received his B.A. in philosophy from the University of Southern California, followed by his LL.B. at Stanford University, and a Certificate from the Hague Academy of International Law, which he received in 1961.

He has a list of professional affiliations. He was Deputy Attorney General in California, followed by attorney in the Civil Rights Division of the U. S. Department of Justice in 1958-59, followed by an appointment to Ohio State University Law School, where he served in successive posts of Assistant Dean, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor of Law.

In 1964 he was appointed to Professor at the Duke University Law School, and is currently on leave, serving as a Senior Fellow at the Yale University Law School.

It is indeed a privilege of mine, in behalf of NASPA, to give you official welcome to us here at NASPA, and also certainly it is an honor and a privilege to introduce Professor Van Alstyne to you. (Applause)

PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. VAN ALSTYNE (Professor of Law, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina): Well, thank you very much for that introduction. I am afraid I am much more impressed by the introduction than you gentlemen are likely to be by what follows.

It reminds me ever so slightly of a story of John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard economist, Ambassador to India, and very well known author who, among his foibles, is considered slightly egotistical. The story runs that someone, to bring his egotism home to him, sent him a Christmas card on his birthday. (Laughter)

But Galbraith was quite equal to the occasion. He sent back a note to this chap, and he said, "I am most grateful for your very pre-Christmas card, but I am afraid there has been some mistake. Surely you intended it for my son." (Laughter) I hope to be not quite so misled by the sterling introduction as Mr. Galbraith has by some of his own writings.

This subject is a most awkward one for me to discuss with you, because it is subject to the observation of Oliver Wendell Holmes, that general propositions cannot solve concrete cases. Another way of putting that difficulty, in this setting, is simply that a kind of general outline of due process, as required by the Fourteenth Amendment, and applied to public universities, is simply not going to resolve specific problems which you may have in mind, or specific issues which may be a source of controversy on your campuses now, or in the foreseeable future.

Because that is so, I am really going deliberately, and not by defaulting on my obligations, deliberately going to hold my introductory remarks fairly brief, to make some general observations, but at least indicate the areas of interest and of concern, and with the background that you have had from this morning's session, hope that this preliminary statement will prompt you to come forward with the kind of problems which you think civil libertarians or constitutional authorities may not properly appreciate in the hard-bitten setting that you have to deal with as administrators. In short, I am going to talk for no more than fifteen or twenty minutes, and if you do not have a disagreement to state, or questions to ask, then at least this session will have the blessing of being the briefest of the whole meeting.

The proposition of legal due process for students has to be addressed at two stages, the first of which we can

dispatch in fairly short order, but in dispatching with it, I hope to disillusion you of what has been the traditional approach to due process.

We are, as you know, in a system of federal government. You have dual sovereignty, and we are accountable to the state sets of laws, and to the federal law.

The problem of student rights has historically been one principally of concern only to the state courts, and it has been in the state courts that the students have received extremely short shrift.

Because of the attitude of the state courts, counsel for universities have correctly indicated that there are virtually no legal hazards that university administrators need bother about, that whatever the arguable fairness or unfairness of the procedures they follow in disciplining students, or whatever the arguable fair or arbitrary character of the substantive rules, the kinds of things for which students may be dismissed, that these are essentially simply issues of policy, that the state courts will not interfere, and that students wealthy enough, but stupid enough to take their complaint to the courts will be turned aside.

In preparing for this meeting, and in trying to prepare some of my own writings, I have canvassed many of the personnel monographs which are probably standard fare in your own offices, and in some of the traditional legal encyclopedias. They are, from the students' point of view, extremely bleak, but they are accurate in terms of state court response.

I would like to simply read one or two quotations from the state courts to indicate their relative indifference to student rights. These quotations should make fairly clear that there is not essentially any real legal due process available at the hands of the state courts.

This is the attitude, for instance, that the supreme court of Illinois took toward the status of a student in the University of Illinois, as of 1891, a view which still persists in many jurisdictions:

By voluntarily entering the university, or being placed there by those having the right to control him, he, the student, necessarily surrenders very many of his individual rights, how his time shall be occupied, what his habits shall be, his general deportment, that he shall not visit certain places, his hours of study and recreation -- in all these matters, and others, he must yield obedience to those who, for the time being, are his masters.

Or another court, invoking the time-honored rubric of in loco parentis, a standard defense in the hands of any competent administrator, as to the mental training, moral

and physical discipline and welfare of the pupil, college authorities stand in loco parentis, and in their discretion may make any regulation for their government which a parent could make for the same purpose.

The problem of what constitutes an appropriate reason must clearly be left to those authorities charged with the duty of maintaining the standards and discipline of the school.

"I hold," said this judge, "as a matter of law that the defendant is not required to hold any hearing before dismissing a student."

Well, I could go on and repeat similar utterances by other courts. Indeed, in surveying better than eighty student cases brought to the attention of state courts, very, very few of them resulted in favor of the student, no matter how unreasonable to you gentlemen the particular rule invoked in dismissing the student, or truncated nature of the summary procedure which preceded his dismissal involved.

There are several reasons for this. One is simply that the courts have been traditionally reluctant to get into what seemed to be to them an administrative swamp. They did not want to try to second guess the intelligence with which university personnel handled students.

Another has been simply that the concept of in loco parentis did historically have some validity. Historically, the majority of students attending American colleges were young, they were minors, in view of the law -- that is under 21 and under 18. Historically colleges were small. They were general function units, not special function units, as they principally are today, and they did serve to a considerable extent as surrogate parents.

Now much of this has changed. The reason for the view of in loco parentis does not persist, though the attitude does persist in the minds of many state courts. As a matter of raw statistics, for instance, it has changed because students are older. As a matter of fact, less than seven percent of all students currently attending American colleges are under the age of 18, and it is the age of 18 which for most legal purposes establishes adulthood. Even according to the common law the notion of in loco parentis, that is of the university occupying the same unchallengeable position of authority, vis a vis the student, would no longer persist.

Again, as a matter of statistics, there are more students in American colleges over the age of thirty than there are under the age of eighteen. So the historical background really has just a bare relevance. Indeed, during the controversy in California last fall, a tentative defense offered by the university was one of in loco

parentis, but they quickly withdrew on that basis when it was pointed out that the student body at Berkeley, which is topheavy with graduate students, really scarcely has anyone who is technically subject to that formula any more.

Another way of summarizing the same point, I think, has been well put by Professor Henry Steele Commager, when he looked back at in loco parentis about a year and a half ago, and this is how he described it:

"The concept of in loco parentis was transferred from Cambridge to America, and caught on here even more strongly for very elementary reasons. College students were, for the most part, very young. A great many boys went to college in the colonial era at the age of 13, 14, and 15. They were, for most purposes, what our young high school students are now. They did need taking care of, and the tutors were in loco parentis. This habit was reinforced with the coming of education for girls and of coeducation. Ours was not a class society. There was no common body of tradition and habit connected with membership in an aristocracy or in an upperclass which would provide some assurance of conduct.

"All of this," submits Professor Commager, "has now changed. Students generally are at least eighteen when they come up, and we have a long tradition with coeducation from high school on. Many students marry at eighteen and nineteen and have families. Furthermore, we have adjusted to the classless society and we know our way about. Therefore, the old tradition of in loco parentis is largely irrelevant."

Well, the state courts continue to take the traditional view, and whether one agrees with it or not, it terminates the discussion on legal due process at the state law level. Essentially, there is none. Whether you look on it with foreboding or with rejoicing, it is a fact, and one has to contend with it.

But there is another level of law, and that is the federal courts. Since 1960 there have been four reported cases of a non-racial character -- and I put those aside very deliberately, for obvious reasons -- four cases that have filtered through the federal courts testing student claims of academic freedom on claims of having been dismissed for one reason or another from a public university.

Three out of four of those decisions have gone in favor of the students. All three of them were based not upon local law notions, property concept or contract -- what the character of the contract was between the student and the university -- but rather each of these cases was decided on that ambiguous clause in the constitution, the due process clause. It is essentially the Fourteenth Amendment which represents the effervescence of legal student academic freedom in the United States.

The future suggests, the trend of cases suggests that students seeking relief from what they regard as either arbitrary procedures, or arbitrary rules will have considerable success in the federal courts invoking the Fourteenth Amendment, unless many of the institutions show more progressive attitudes in overhauling the character of their rules and their procedures.

In addressing oneself to constitutional limitations on institutional authority and autonomy, those of you who are even casually acquainted with constitutional law might immediately suppose that nothing further in this discussion would have any relevance whatever to those universities and colleges which are technically private schools, because, of course, the Fourteenth Amendment does not apply to private organizations.

It does not apply to a corporation, for instance, which can fire its personnel and deal pretty much, for constitutional purposes, on any terms that it can secure in the market place.

It is therefore quite reasonable that those of you attached to private schools would feel that there is no constitutional difficulty, that (like the private business organization) to the extent that you can secure from the student an agreement that he will withdraw when he is told to do so, with or without sufficient reason. Whether that is a good policy or not, at least it is safe constitutional law.

But that is not necessarily so. It is true that the Fourteenth Amendment says "no state shall deprive any person of liberty or due process" rather than "no person shall deprive any other person." But as many of you may know, the concept of what is state action has gradually undergone a very substantial expansion in the work of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I do want to tell you of one case which I think will be extremely illustrative and indicative of what is likely to happen with regard to the application of constitutional law, to universities which have previously thought of themselves as exempt from this kind of consideration.

The case is called *Simpkins vs. The Moses Cohen Hospital*. The Moses Cohen Hospital is a privately owned, privately endowed, commercially operated hospital in North Carolina. The hospital had a policy of not allowing Negro doctors to practice in the hospital, and it would segregate Negro patients. On occasion it would even turn them away. They felt there was no constitutional difficulty about this, however, because they were private and not subject to the equal protection clause of the constitution.

However, the Moses Cohen Hospital did enjoy a great

deal of financial subsidy under the Hill-Burton Act. A lot of its facilities were made possible by federal grants. It enjoyed the benefit of a number of federal medical research contracts. The infusion of federal money simultaneously met the infusion of federal responsibility, of constitutional responsibility. On the strength of the governmental connections which contributed to the success, the prosperity, the operation of the hospital, the equal protection clause was applied to the Moses Cohen Hospital, and their policy of segregation and racial discrimination was ended, exclusively on Fourteenth Amendment grounds.

The story has obvious significance for all universities currently receiving federal and state funds. To the extent you participate in governmental largess, you do become amenable to the same restraints to which government itself is subject.

Now I have not wanted, though I may have done so, to oversimplify, and suggest that every dollar of federal money brings some kind of equal amount of constitutional control. The concept of state action is more flexible than that, but with regard to the future, I do submit to you that no matter how you may regard yourself in terms of state law, though you are privately incorporated, though your charter is in order, though the majority of the funds are by private gift, and so on, the gradual provision of governmental largess, which has spread the constitution in so many other areas of American life, applies equally to the educational frontier of the United States as well.

There are few colleges, in my judgment, which, for all purposes under the Fourteenth Amendment, are still wholly private in the sense of being safely able to disregard the minimum standards of fair play required by the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Finally then, a rough outline as to the nature of things which the Fourteenth Amendment may require. The subject has to be split very deliberately to treat substantive and procedural processes, because the constitution will recognize even among public bodies that we are a pluralistic society, that even public institutions may differ in significant respects as to the goals they wish to pursue, and the means by which they wish to reach them.

There is not, in the due process clause, a kind of conformist sterility which says that all public educational institutions must have a standard curriculum, they may not forbid more than one kind of misconduct, and so on.

In short, there is a lot of latitude under the Fourteenth Amendment with respect to the kind of misconduct which a university may safely make the ground of dismissal or penalty for the part of the student. Pluralism is

recognized, there is a lot more liberty with regard to varieties of misconduct subject to university discipline, even in public institutions. There is less latitude when you turn to the other half of due process; namely, not what are the kinds of things which a university may forbid of its students, or may require of the students, but what is the procedure employed to determine whether the given act was actually committed, and what penalty ought to appropriately be attached if a determination of guilt is made. It is an easily stated difference in terms of illustration.

Murder, that is, making the taking of life a crime, is a question of substantive due process easily resolved. The question is simply whether the state has legitimate interest in protecting life by punishing those who take it.

Procedural due process would address itself to how you determine whether somebody accused of murder committed the offense, and what penalty appropriately follows in the event that a determination of guilt is made. It is in the area of procedural due process where the Supreme Court, and the lower Federal courts have gradually required more by way of standard procedure -- less pluralism, more conformity to certain standards of fundamental fair play.

To get quite specific about it, as a general thumb-nail rule, the university administrator is reasonably safe in suggesting that the greater the consequences which the student may endure from a determination of guilt under any given university, the greater must be the measure of procedural due process. Again, two easy illustrations.

A student who is accused of having parked overtime on campus may be dealt with in an extremely casual fashion, assuming of course that the kind of penalty that follows for that kind of misconduct is fairly trivial; to say at most, a \$5.00 or \$10.00 fine, or temporary suspension of parking privileges on campus. Because the kind of harm or injury the student may endure is relatively slight, the degree of procedural due process to which he is entitled before that penalty is imposed may be correspondingly slight. Consequently, this might be the kind of situation readily disposed of in an informal conversation between an extremely subordinate administrative individual, and the student involved.

The greater the gravity of harm the student may endure, however, the fuller the process must become. To take the other extreme, a student -- and I take this extreme case just to illustrate a point -- a student accused of homosexual conduct on campus, as a result of which he may be dismissed, and the dismissal barring him from other colleges, probably terminating a great deal of professional opportunity, and most certainly, if any publicity is given to the determination of guilt, of bringing upon him the most significant form

of public stigma that is possible in our society, that determination would probably require the fullest kind of procedural due process, and by full due process.

In order to try to make this specific, I mean things such as this: The student would have to be given a written statement of charges well in advance of any hearings scheduled to be held to determine whether he was guilty of that offense. He would by all means be entitled to an adviser of his choice, and with regard to an offense so serious as this, where the consequence is so grave as this, my prediction would be, and indeed the Federal courts have come very close so to hold it, that he would be entitled to a counsel, a lawyer, no matter how much chagrin that may fill you with. He obviously is entitled to a hearing of a reasonably formal character. And by a hearing, I mean not merely an opportunity to state his position on the case, to be represented by counsel, but also to bring in witnesses in support of whatever he has to say, and a right to cross examine those who appear against him.

One Federal court has gone so far as to say that even in the event that the university lacks the legal capacity to insure the appearance of adverse witnesses, such as an individual who is himself not a student, and who the university has no power to bring into this hearing, even in that event, the university is under an obligation, if they use that witness's testimony at all, at least to summarize the contents of what he has to say and make that content available to the student who has been accused, so that the accused student then is in a position to know what he has to contend with, what has been said of him, what facts he has to rebut, if indeed he has the capacity to rebut them at all.

The board before whom this hearing would be held would have to be neutral in the sense, obviously, that no member of the board making the decision of guilt could involve either a witness or persons bringing the charge.

Again, although that might seem a terribly self-evident matter, inasmuch as not infrequently charges of student misconduct are brought by administrative personnel, it does suggest that to the extent they participate in a kind of prosecutorial function, they may not simultaneously, in these very serious cases, participate in a judicial capacity. You cannot both be in the position of bringing the charge and determining guilt.

Finally, it is my guess -- this is more speculative and I do not say this with great confidence, although I would recommend it as sound policy, whether or not it is constitutionally required -- the university in the most grave cases may also be required to maintain a record of this hearing. But to take some of the enormity of that suggestion away, by a record I do not mean that even in these

grave offenses you are under the burden of bringing in a stenographer to take verbatim notes, and then at great cost and great delay have those all typed up into bundles of copies for all participants.

To the contrary, a verbatim record is made if you simply have a tape recording of the whole meeting. Then in the event the university's action is questioned in a court -- that is, the student is unhappy with the decision reached and attempts to go to court, you have the tape recording which can then be made into a single copy and the court has something to review.

The record in this situation is at least equally for the protection of the university as it is for the student, for ordinarily even the most considerate, conscientious Federal court will not second guess the university's determination, even of grave offenses. It is very concerned that correct procedure was followed; that this fellow had a fair opportunity to state his defense, to offer his witnesses, to cross examine other witnesses, and this kind of thing.

That can be readily determined by looking at the record. To put it differently, and in a more technical parlance, what the court does in these kinds of cases is very much the same thing it does in reviewing appeals taken from administrative agencies across the board; the Interstate Commerce Commission or the National Labor Relations Board, or any number of other things.

Ordinarily the decision of the board, in this case the decision of the university, will be sustained if, in the judgment of the court, there is substantial evidence to support that decision on the record taken as a whole. Not whether the judge agrees with the decision. Simply whether it is substantially supported.

Now, I advise you of that because it does demonstrate that the record is of great help to the university as well as to the student. It means therefore that you would not have to endure an original court proceeding. There would not be a whole new trial, but the judge would simply review the record to determine whether there was substantial evidence to support it.

Between these two poles, between the \$5.00 over-time parking offense and the student accused of homosexual activity on campus, facing expulsion, an enormous stigma, you have to arrange the multitude of other possible offenses and I do not proceed doggedly to plow through all of that with you.

I do suggest, simply as a general proposition, that the measure of procedural due process is graduated. It is in direct proportion to the gravity of the consequence

which one may endure as a consequence of that final decision.

As an operating, and as a practical suggestion, not as a legal matter, I think that universities can comport with these tentative suggested, probable constitutional standards and procedural due process, by making very minor changes to their existing very informal procedures.

Nothing I have said thus far has meant to suggest that universities must suddenly establish formal hearing boards for all kinds of offenses. I think as a practical accommodation what a university can do is this:

Knowing in advance that in more than nine out of ten cases the student is satisfied with the result, which does not mean that he is necessarily happy with it, but that he is not so unhappy as to want to take an appeal anywhere else -- knowing in advance that in nine out of ten cases that a student will be satisfied with the result, the university, for practical reasons, might simply continue whatever informal structure it has at the first level of dealing with all of these offenses. Then with regard to those offenses where the student takes exception to the result, at the time he was informally dealt with, if it is a grave matter, then he should become eligible to a new hearing, so that it would be an easy matter for a university, no matter how small or large, to establish a panel which is available to follow these procedures in a routine fashion for that small number of cases in which the student feels he has been unjustly dealt with in the informal proceeding.

I think, for instance, one complaint I have heard against the trend of constitutionally required procedural due process can be met if you do not insist upon putting this formal procedure into effect in every case, but you have it available, and its availability is publicized in a fair manner to the students, they understand their right to appeal to this more formal panel under appropriate circumstances, but that it is not mandatory; they do not have to, and you do not have to pursue it in the first instance.

I think in that way one can combine administrative feasibility with a kind of fundamental fair play which is reasonably being required now by the Federal courts.

The other subject, substantive due process, as I warned you, is not one that can be addressed in a coherent fashion. Because we are a pluralistic society, what one university may desire in terms of how one dresses, or whether he is allowed alcohol in the room, or parietal controls of this kind, there is obviously so much latitude there is just no sensible foundation of ordering a general discussion.

I would offer one remark, however. The Supreme Court, and quite properly in my judgment, has in recent

decades laid enormous stress on what we desire to call the centrality of a democratic process, and I can relate that, I think, to what the study was all about this morning. Most of the concerns of the NASPA study seemed to me, as they surely must to you, to be concerned with a very narrow band, numerically, of alleged student misconduct.

It all has to do with freedom of expression of one kind or another. It did not go to alcohol control. It does not seem to be a substantial problem, among other things. It is in this area, however, freedom of speech, freedom to inquire, freedom for the unorthodox by way of expression, consideration, review and listening, where the court has an enormous concern.

A case decided last year, having nothing to do with universities, should indicate the extent of the Supreme Court's concern for the openness of the market place in what is politically a pragmatic society. It is the case of the New York Times vs. Sullivan, a case which has jettisoned a several hundred years tradition upholding the common law of libel. It was a case, as you may recall, in which statements were published in the New York Times in an advertisement, alleging certain things about the officials of Birmingham. Some of the statements were factually untrue, and a jury in Alabama found that the falsity of the statement injured the professional reputation of several of the public officials, and under standard tort law theory they were entitled to recover damages.

The measure of damages was astounding, but that was not an issue in the case. The damages were a half million dollars. In any case, the case is instructive, because the Court held that absent a showing of malice, even false statements which are in fact injurious to a public official may not be made the subject of an ordinary civil lawsuit, so great is the protection for the freedom of political discussion today in the United States.

Now there is a message here with regard to universities which, according to my reading of the study, are vulnerable to lawsuits in the Federal courts to the extent that they make their facilities available for some off campus speakers whose point of view may harmonize or at least seem permissible to them, but then close up the market place, and seal it off inhospitably to points of view which they think are harmful.

The commitment of the first amendment, and through the Fourteenth Amendment, the commitment necessarily of public universities is to a proposition best stated by Oliver Wendell Holmes a number of years ago. Although it sounds more poetic than legal, it has been translated, as I have tried to indicate in the New York Times case, into our law. The statement is this, and it is a statement not merely

with regard to politics and freedom of expression. To a certain extent it is a theory of knowledge, the pragmatist's creed.

"The best test of truth," said Holmes in 1919, "is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground on which our wishes may safely be carried out.

"That, at any rate, is the theory of our constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year, if not every day, we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system I think we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe, and believe to be fraught with death, unless they shall eminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law, that an immediate check is required to save the country."

The classic statement of the clear and present danger test.

Well, it has great meaning and I do suggest to you, indeed I could recite to you several cases decided within the last several years involving public institutions, and I suggest that universities which make their facilities available to political speakers of any kind, may not then withhold those facilities on invitations being extended by recognized student groups to others because of a hostility to their political affiliation or to the point of view which is expressed.

This is not to say that the students can take over the campus. There is a collateral doctrine of time, place and manner, which certainly applies to the university as it does to the public park or the public streets. The doctrine essentially goes to traffic control, safety regulation. An unreasonable time to schedule a meeting might be when there is a competing university convocation, with respect to which the guest speaker, running in competition, would be a notable distraction. An unreasonable place would be in front of the president's house, or in the hallway of the office building, or next to the classrooms in use. And an unreasonable manner, of course, might be an assembly or demonstration conducted in such a riotous fashion that it is an absolute distraction from other business in which the university has a legitimate interest.

But you will notice that these are essentially traffic regulations. They do not censor nor punish speech because of disagreement with the content of the speech. They simply are essentially to maintain order and to maximize the space for those who are otherwise invited to use it.

At any rate, other issues universities may take a variety of attitudes on. They are not regarded as so signifi-

cant to the maturation, the civilization, the growth, the education of the student as to whether he has alcohol in his room, or whether girls can visit it, that it really states a constitutional problem.

Just as procedural due process is a graduated phenomenon depending upon the gravity of the consequence the student may have to endure as a result of a determination of guilt, substantive due process in our time has also tended to be a graduated phenomenon.

The measure of protection increases under the Fourteenth Amendment, the closer to the center of the democratic process the character of the right being exercised is, on the part of the student.

Now I warned you that these remarks would tend to be general, and I deliberately mean to close just at this stage hoping that perhaps what I have had to say, offered in a fairly belligerent style, may prompt you to come out with some suggestions of your own, or some questions.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: Thank you, Professor Van Alstyne, for your very informative and we would say thought-provoking remarks.

We would follow our usual procedure, and that is that those of you who would like to ask questions or make comments, please feel free to do so.

... General discussion ensued ...

SEMINAR
"Student Financial Aid --
Packaged Pressure"
Monday - April 5, 1965

The seminar convened in the Alexandria Room, William H. Knapp, Assistant Director of the Division of Student Personnel, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, presiding.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: I know you are all familiar with what was formerly known as Commission VI of NASPA. It was alleged that there was some information available, and some interest as a result thereof in the college work-study program, the National Defense Student Loan program, and the (hopefully soon to be) scholarship program.

Those of us who have had any experience from the beginning were aware that higher education might not be too happy, might have some comments to make about the pressures that resulted from the creation of new programs -- because of the newness of the program, you understand, not because of any reluctance to change on our part.

In looking around for the people who might present points of view I came upon sort of a ready, and readily organized group of people who have varying identifications with these new programs.

Jack Critchfield, who is Director of Admissions and Financial Assistance at the University of Pittsburgh, represents a sort of schizophrenic approach, with both of these jobs combined, and I thought might be concerned with identification and recruitment, as I am sure he is.

Jim Bowman, on my left, from the Johns-Hopkins University, has a background in economics, and one of the impacts, of course, of these new programs on every campus is in the area of open and hidden costs, and Jim has agreed to comment on some of those aspects.

Bill Van Dusen, at my far left -- and the fact that he is from Wayne State University does not represent nepotism, believe me, but he has lived through the organizational stage of the National Defense Student Loan program, the college work-study program, and more recently has been testifying before Congresswoman Green and Senator Morse on the Title 4 provisions of the new higher education assistance act.

When I sent this memorandum around, Bill was designated to speak on "Came the Dawn." Then we thought that Jim Moore doesn't get hit over the head enough as Director of the College Work-Study program in the Office of Education, and it would be only fair to him to ask him to sit and listen

to the other three, and then either mop up the discussion, or mop up the panel as he sees fit.

The order of appearance will be Critchfield, Bowman, Van Dusen, Moore, and further deponent saith naught.

DIRECTOR JACK CRITCHFIELD (Director of Admissions and Financial Assistance, University of Pittsburgh): Thank you, Bill.

When I was asked to be a member of this panel, I was very pleased to accept because I am most interested in all of the aspects of the new Federal Aid to Education, and the work-study program, the federal loan, and hopefully the federal scholarship program, which will enable us to do more in the way of packaging awards throughout this country, and in attracting more students who, as of this date at least, are not seeking college because no one is seeking them, and they are not motivated from within to seek us out.

There are some reservations I have. Bill Knapp implied, at least, that the person who is in charge of both admissions and student aid might be a bit schizophrenic, and I believe I am, and if not, I am going to become that way.

But I think there are some advantages to this two-fold position, especially in locating, identifying and in enrolling students from areas that are so deprived that many of us cannot even imagine it.

I have one particular fear that we are going, in many institutions, to create more of an open door policy for admissions than any of us have ever thought of in the past, and my major fear in connection with that is that this open door policy does not in fact become a revolving door policy.

There are many, many problems associated with locating and enrolling disadvantaged youth, and I would like to generalize and name about five, and then talk a little bit about some of the experience we have had at the University.

The first problem I would like to suggest is this: How are we to choose from among the great number of ill prepared students those who have enough potential to succeed in higher education?

This is really identification. I think most of us have learned a long time ago that when we are talking about youngsters who have been culturally deprived and economically deprived, the result of standardized tests that many of us use for admission are no longer very valid in predicting college success, that we somehow or another have to find other means.

Secondly, I think we have also found quite often that the youngsters we are talking about come from secondary schools in urban areas, or in suburban areas, rural areas, wherever they may be located, that are substandard as secondary schools go, that the competition within those schools is quite weak, that the motivation that should exist there from the top students is not existing. Those who have the best ability are earning grades without too much effort and well, to speak very frankly, we have found very often that the student is quite a "C" student if he were to be in another school.

The second problem I would like to suggest is this: How are these youngsters to be motivated sufficiently to want to further their education? I mean real, firm motivation, not that which we might push upon them or suggest to them by indicating now that somehow or the other there is a way for them to become educated through financial resources.

The third problem: How are their costs to be met? This is the one that we are centering on. Will the combined aids now to become available through the federal program and college facilities, the individual colleges, the state programs, will there be enough to finance the education of all of these youngsters, if in fact we do find a way to recognize them and motivate them towards college?

The fourth problem I would suggest is: How are the costs of properly providing for their education to be met? This is still a difficult problem. If we meet the individual cost that a youngster has at our institution, this is taking care of him. But there is already strong evidence to indicate that the cost of educating the disadvantaged youngster is going to be, in many cases, far greater than the cost of educating the average or above average, or even superior student who is now enrolled in college. Special programs will inevitably be needed.

Problem five: How are they to be educated without reducing the quality of higher education for those students who have been fortunate enough to be properly prepared for a richer academic program? This one has become a real concern for a number of institutions that are now involved in this to a very great extent.

This is one -- there are more than one, I am sure, but there is one very encouraging program that has been in effect recently that I would like to relate to those of you who may not have read about. I am sure there are others, but I would like to give an optimistic note before I go into our own experience at Pitt, which has not been too encouraging.

Last summer, in May, in the New York City area

250 socially, economically and culturally deprived youngsters were admitted to Queensboro and Bronx Community Colleges, in New York City, 125 of these youngsters to each school.

None of the students were admissible according to their normal standards for admission. But all were specially selected by principals and counselors in the secondary schools. During the summer the students received remedial work in each of these two colleges in math, and special instruction in college level reading. They also received special advisement and guidance. Financial need was met in every case, and they enrolled in the regular liberal arts and science program in September of 1964.

All of these youngsters wanted to go to college, and at mid-term over 200 of the 250 were still enrolled, and at the last reading it appeared as though at least 200 of the 250 are going to be earning average or better records by the end of the first year.

The program seems to offer much promise, and, by the way, it is completely financed by the New York State Legislature.

Now, contrary to that particular experience, which I think is a good one and which gives us hope that there is a way of finding these people, selecting them by means other than those we have used for the traditionally average or better than average student, is this experience that we have had at Pitt.

We have been involved in this for five years now. This is not something that we are getting into brand new. The university is located, as you know, in the city of Pittsburgh, which in a real sense is a pocket of poverty. Forty percent of the families of the city earn less than \$4,000 a year, and a recent study by the Fels Institute found that over 21,000 public school youngsters were failing one-half grade or more below normal standards in the Pittsburgh public schools. About one out of every three children in the Pittsburgh public schools were in this category.

Pittsburgh has 3.5 percent of all the state's pupils, but 8.9 percent of the state's low achievers. Philadelphia's problems are even greater as reported by the Fels Institute.

So we are in a pocket of poverty. We have realized this, as I say, a long time ago; about five years ago we began to do something about it, or tried to do something about it, with not enough funds, and not really enough direction to know where we were going.

We have been visiting all city high schools, speaking with interested students, entire classes, counselors and

teachers, principals, anyone who would listen, in an effort to create interest in higher education in general, and in the University of Pittsburgh in particular.

We have received applications from disadvantaged youngsters with great success, and we have reviewed them with great care, having consulted with their high school counselors, and oftentimes with parents to determine who can be admitted, in some cases throwing test scores to the side, in taking something of the strength of the individual high school record and the recommendation of the secondary school people to determine admission.

We have worked closely with the Urban League of the city of Pittsburgh in providing special scholarship assistance to package with loans to meet financial need of these college costs, and in some cases we have provided jobs.

We have provided special summer programs of remedial study and counseling prior to fall term enrollment. We have done, and are doing this between the junior and senior years in high school as well as between the graduation in June and the enrollment in September.

We have assigned special advisers, student tutors, and have reduced credit loads to the minimum requirement of full time students.

At the university this has not been enough. Less than one in five youngsters have succeeded beyond the sophomore year, and only one in four have continued beyond the freshman year.

This past summer the university selected 25 youngsters from ten different high schools of the city, and these high schools were located in the real deprived areas. They were selected for remedial summer work, and then for admission to this past September's entering class. All of these students ranged in the upper two-fifths of their high school classes, with essentially B- to A records. Eight were in the upper ten percent of their classes with outstanding secondary school records, yet few, if any, would have been admissible if considered in the same manner as other entering freshmen, primarily because of poor test results, both on the scholastic aptitude tests, which we require, and the achievement examinations of the college boards.

With the exception of one score, all verbal SAT scores were less than 450, and one-half in the 300's. The average verbal score of this group of 25 was 402, and the average math score was a bit better, 457.

All of these youngsters stated their desire to attend college. All were recommended by their high school, and all had financial need which was met by scholarships,

loans and jobs. Jobs were awarded only when absolutely necessary, since previous experience suggested that all free time would be needed for study.

The first trimester grades for these students with quality point averages above a C, 2.00. One was a 2.15, one a 2.14, and one a 2.07. The next highest earned was a 1.85 and the remaining QPA's were all below 1.50. Three of the students, despite efforts exerted to keep them interested, chose to withdraw before grades were received.

A very unhappy experience, one that has caused us great concern, and in five years of experience we seem not to be batting any better in the way of an average than we were five years ago.

Now some of these reasons unquestionably are due to the university of Pittsburgh. Our success ratio might improve if we had made some changes. I would like to relate some of these to you, because I think some of them may in turn reflect upon institutions that are represented here.

We operate under the trimester program which is designed to speed up education, and in fact, for these youngsters we may have to speed it down.

Secondly, we are large and diverse, and maybe we need smallness and little latitude in the academic program.

Third, we have required courses in the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities in the freshman year and maybe this is too soon for these disadvantaged youth.

Fourth, we are expensive, and maybe the economic differences among our students are too great. Even in meeting the calculated need of these youngsters, they still are considerably below many of our other students who have come without any assistance, and come from families that have considerable wealth.

Fifth, we do not provide enough aid to enable our local students to live on campus and maybe all that is gained on campus during the day is lost at home at nights and on weekends, because really we are picking them out of this environment for a very brief period of time, and we are throwing them back in the evening and on weekends, and during the summer. This is an institutional weakness because we are not able to afford them, yet we are located in the middle of this poverty area, and in fact could serve a greater number by being close enough for them to commute from home.

Sixth, and this one concerns me. We have reached far below our normal standards to accept these youngsters and in so doing we may be subjecting them to a handicap that

is far too great to overcome until their secondary school preparation is improved tremendously. I speak very frankly. I think we have enough evidence -- we are not the best researchers in the admissions group and the people who are involved with us at Pitt, but I think we have enough evidence to prove in Pittsburgh, at least, that the schools that serve the disadvantaged youngsters are definitely far below par, for any of a number of reasons.

Seventh, we tend -- and this is really because of inadequate scholarship funds -- we tend to meet a large portion of an individual's financial need with a loan, which he often really does not understand. Even worse, in my opinion, we saddle him to a job which pays for less than one-fourth of his expenses, and eliminates one-third of his much needed study time, which again is one of my concerns with the work-study program, at least at the University of Pittsburgh.

I mentioned before that we are not very good researchers, and I might just very quickly insert a little story here. I read a few weeks ago about the researcher who was studying the specific qualities of a flea. He spent a great deal of time teaching this flea to jump over a pencil when he held it off the desk, and he would say, "Flea, jump," and the flea would jump over the pencil.

So after the flea learned this particular trick, he pulled off two of the flea's legs, and he said, "Flea, jump," and the flea jumped over the pencil. Then he pulled off two more and he said, "Flea, jump," and the flea jumped over the pencil. And he pulled off two more, and the same thing, and he finally pulled off the last two, and he said, "Flea, jump over the pencil," and the flea didn't move. So he wrote in his conclusions: "When you pull all of the legs off a flea, he becomes deaf." (Laughter)

Maybe there is a great deal too much research like this that has been done, and it has been somewhat haphazard, and it has been forced in terms of what we are dealing with when we are dealing with disadvantaged youth and how we might educate them.

I believe strongly that college faculty members and administrators must learn more about deprivation than they now know. So must admissions officers and all student affairs people. Somewhere there has to be a key to identifying untapped ability and potential among students of the deprived areas. The admissions officer must know more about the unique academic, social and cultural dimensions of his college. He must be able to relate the real character of his institution to the character of the surroundings of the culturally deprived youngsters, and when incompatible, as is now most often the case, he must suggest changes within his institution and its program that will make possible the bridging of this tremendous gap that now exists.

If the need for these changes is not made known, or if special programs are not to be part of higher education's role in this educational revolution, then I feel that the revolution will fail regardless of the efforts of the federal government, or state government, or any groups in providing economic means for equal educational opportunities.

Packaged awards of federal aid, consisting of scholarships, National Defense Student Loans, and work-study jobs will likely provide the opportunity for a vast number of these deprived youngsters to at least enroll in higher education. The financial need will be met. But I believe unless institutions of higher learning, both state and private, are strongly committed to providing the effort, time and dedication necessary to make this financed opportunity truly an equal one, I fear that many dollars may be falsely invested, and more important that many young persons who might otherwise be graduated from college, will find the open door to education revolving so rapidly that far too many will be returned to continued lives of deprivation.

I have real concern about two parts of the proposed legislation, and the legislation that is now in effect. I fear very strongly that many of the young people about whom we are talking, are located in urban areas and they are being served, or can be served by institutions that too often cost much too much even for the packaged award that will be made available if federal scholarships come into reality.

My second concern I have already expressed, and here again I admit this: It may only be true to an institution that is committed to a trimester program. We have not found it possible for the youngsters who are really below average when they come into the university to handle a job that will meet any amount of their real expense and find enough study time to succeed academically.

Thank you. (Applause)

DIRECTOR JAMES L. BOWMAN (Director of Financial Aids, The Johns-Hopkins University): Jack, after your presentation, I almost hate to get up, because I think you have touched on some aspects, in a very delightful way, in which Bill and I are concerned perhaps in a more specialized way. I think it set a very admirable tone for the discussion this evening.

As Bill Knapp said originally, the pressure in a package emanates from many sources. Jack, in his discussion, talked primarily of the need to seek these students out, and the difficulties that Pitt has faced in working with them.

Now I feel somewhat odd standing up here as a Financial Aid officer in an institution which does not participate in the work-study program, but I think in the discussion

I can outline some of the reasons why, and perhaps some factors associated with the program that individuals have not thought about to a great extent.

This of course is the cost of the work-study program as it is presently set up, both the very real costs, which are self evident, and the hidden costs which are contained within the package if an institution is in actuality to perform as the Office of Education would like us to, and as the whole legislation is designed to do, and this is the actively going out and seeking, recruiting from the low income groups.

I think one thing we should keep very firmly in mind is that this is not a program designed to assist us in meeting the needs of the students who are already part of our population, but rather a program designed to go out and induce individuals who are not now considering college to do so.

Well, I think Jack summed it up very well when he mentioned the factor that to high cost institutions, the resources available to them are not sufficient to carry out the mandates of the program.

I think even with the advent of a federally supported scholarship bill that again, in the high cost institutions, that we will not be able to do the job which we would like to do.

First of all, in packaging awards you are limited to the extent that you can burden a student down, any student, and most particularly one from a marginal income group where the background, the enriched high school programs, and so forth, will not have been part of his background. To limit him or to saddle him with a great deal of work is to give him two strikes before he even begins.

Secondly, the aspect of a loan. We have tended in recent years to be quite frightened by the proliferation of loans to meet student needs. I do not say that I am not a firm believer in loans, but rather that when we begin to saddle beyond some point, that we are ultimately proving detrimental.

Then, too, the summer earnings that a student has tend to be limited, either on his own or under work-study, somewhere let's say in the neighborhood of \$400.00.

So if we look at summer employment at \$400.00, campus or term time employment of \$400.00, and a reasonable loan let's say somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500.00 per academic year, this is resources of some \$1300 to the student and in terms of high cost institutions -- and I frankly admit that Hopkins is one of these -- with a resident budget

of somewhere around \$3100.00 or \$3200.00, this means then that in order to induce this individual to a campus such as Johns-Hopkins, this means a supplementing from our own scholarship funds in the absence of a federal program at the present time of somewhere around \$2,000.00 per annum.

That makes it extremely difficult, from an institutional point of view, when you are looking at your total population. Let us face it, although we meet need, aid funds are still used as a recruiting device to some point. This means the choice between helping perhaps two or three individuals to come to your university, supplemented with loans, as against one individual from under the auspices of the so-called poverty program.

This then is a very real cost to the institution, and one which throws up the first road blocks to many institutions participating.

Second is the hidden costs involved which are not on their face part of the program, but yet, to the institution become very, very real. In the short run these costs will have to be borne by the institution, such costs as are needed by the remedial and special orientation programs, which are needed for this group of students. In his discussion Jack mentioned bringing the students in the summer before and giving them a special remedial program to bring their level up to that which we hope will approximate the rest of the population of the college.

But this is not a one-shot affair. This group must be worked with extremely closely all during their academic career. This will need special counseling, faculty advisers who will have to be reoriented and re-trained in their objectives, all of which are not without cost to an institution.

I mentioned that these tend to be short run aspects because I do feel that in the long run these can, perhaps, not be eliminated certainly, but shifted to the secondary school level.

I have in mind here that if institutions really try to carry out the mandates set forth by the President's program on the Great Society, and working in the poverty area, is that schools or groups of schools will work with high schools and seek to identify youngsters, not in the twelfth grade when they are suddenly faced with the necessity of going into college or forever having the door barred to them, but rather working down at the ninth and tenth grade to identify the students, to assure them that if your potential keeps up, we will guarantee you a college education. We'll make the wherewithal necessary for your attendance in our institution. Then the counselors in the high schools can work with the students in conjunction with the college, and most important, in a program of this nature, is

the motivation of the family toward inducing the child to go to college, because I think we tend to rely -- I know we have at Hopkins and in Jack's mentioning at Pitt -- that we tend to meet the need of the student to meet the educational cost of the institution, but as we visualize the program (and perhaps this is rather esoteric at this time), we feel that if the program is to function effectively, if it is to do the job which it ostensibly has set out to do, that the package deal is not going to be enough. To the income groups from which we are seeking students, the loss of earnings which this youngster can provide to the family immediately after high school is going to be a very real thing.

I think if some way can be found -- and the resources necessary toward this end -- where the student's term-time employment and summer employment can be used to supplement the family income, and that the institution in conjunction with federal programs can meet the out-of-pocket educational costs, I think that this may have a very great affect upon the motivation aspect which Pitt seems to have found was lacking in the group of students that they have.

I by no means condemn the program and say that it should never be. The mere fact that in itself it is not enough for all institutions does not belie its importance. I would point out that the costs are very real, both in explicit costs and implicit costs, to a university, ones that I do not know that the university should have to bear alone. There has been a great deal of agitation for some reimbursement under NDEA programs, and perhaps something similar should be considered in line with the work-study programs, even though we have it for off-campus agencies. Perhaps it should very necessarily be a part of campus employment as well, with the realization that the additional costs incurred by the university, not only in greater supervision, but also the remedial and orientation work with these students.

If these factors can be ironed out -- and I am sure they will be through time -- perhaps we can make very great strides in this area. I think we have a start, but by no means have we reached the limits of the possibilities of working with these students. (Applause)

DIRECTOR WILLIAM VAN DUSEN (Director of the Office of Scholarships, Wayne State University): Most of what I was going to say has been said, so if I seem to lose continuity periodically, it is because I am jumping from place to place.

One of the first things that becomes apparent in the new and the old federal aid to education programs, particularly the financial aid programs, is that they are, first, programs of student financial aid; and second, programs of student personnel; and third, programs in higher education.

The thrusts of the programs definitely are financial. They are to low income families; they are to improve the income earning ability of children from low income families.

I think we have to keep in mind, in considering the pressures that are brought to bear on this, that these are primarily financial pressures, as both Jim and Jack have pointed out. They are pressures on the institution, they are pressures on the student, they are pressures on the student's family.

One of the most surprising things about the dawn, as it arrived with the new federal work-study program, was the whole new set of working relationships that the financial aid officer, who takes the brunt of this program, has to develop. I think all financial aid officers work typically with their admissions office, with their counseling and testing bureaus, with the registrar in registration, but we find now that we have to work with the health service, the placement service, the reading and study skills clinic, the payroll office, the data processing office, the budget office, all the deans, department chairman and instructors who are hiring our students, on a continuing rather than on a casual basis.

In the past, we had an occasional student who needed reading study and efficiency training, but most of our kids, as Jack indicated, were better than average in this area when they came to us.

Now we deal with a group of students who, by and large, need these specialized services on a continuing, rather than on a casual basis. Formerly we dealt with the health service in unusual cases, because most of our students came from families where normal food was available and medical and dental care had been carried on in a routine way, but now we deal with students who come from families where malnutrition is not an unusual circumstance, where kids have never seen a dentist, and have eye problems. So we find ourselves working with the health service on each and every one of these students that we talk with.

Formerly we worked with deans and department chairmen and instructors only when students ran into problems. We assumed that students would go along, and that we would find out when something was amiss. Now we find out that things are always amiss, and we have to keep control, contact and communication open with everyone on our campus.

Further in the recruiting and identifying area, we have had to go at this in an entirely different way. We are not talking about a group of students with whom we have dealt in the past. We are talking about kids we have not found before, and I think we have all had good working relationships

with the secondary schools that have fed us, but we have not done too much with the schools that we did not get kids from. We now find ourselves moving into schools, moving into areas where we have not been before.

We find that we are developing relationships with welfare agencies that we have not had before. We are talking with block clubs, and neighborhood councils. We are working with storefront ministers, with youth club workers, with beauty shop operators. We even find ourselves out recruiting students for other institutions of higher education. This is one thing we have found very frequently in Detroit, that we are no longer representing Wayne State University, but we are representing any institution that we or the kids have ever heard of, because we are the first college person these kids have ever seen, and we are the first representative of an institution of higher education that they have had a chance to talk with.

Their high school counselors, even their elementary school teachers have told them for years that college is possible, but until we appear on the scene, in flesh and blood and alive in front of them, it has never been quite real to them, and I find myself answering questions about U. of D., University of Michigan, and Johns-Hopkins, and Pitt, and all of the rest of them, because I am the first college representative that these kids have talked to.

So I found, in developing and administering the program, that there has been a great deal of pressure to develop new and different and very interesting relationships with people that I have had to deal with only peripherally and exceptionally in the past.

A second pressure, as Jim Bowman pointed out, are the expenses -- not so much the expenses, but who will bear them.

Here we are in the financial aid office, committing our university to correcting the faults of previous education. We bring to campus a group of students who are not as well prepared as our contemporary students are, and if we are to accept the responsibility of these programs, we have to accept, to some extent, the responsibility of correcting the lacks, the deficiencies that these kids have when they arrive.

I hope, as Jim does, that sooner or later we can get the federal government or community action programs, to take over a share of these costs. But at the moment, we stand somewhat alone. We developed a group of students, and we encouraged them, and now we have to deal with them.

We also find that we have to waive a lot of our usual charges, things that we do not normally even consider

in talking with a student. We fortunately do not have either an application fee or a registration deposit, but we do have testing charges, we have health service charges, we have a number of charges which routinely our students have borne, but now we have a group of students for whom it may take four or five weeks to scrape together \$7.50 to register for the SAT. And we find ourselves in a position of waiving these charges and then asking the question, "who's going to pick them up?"

I mentioned before that we are now providing specialized services on a continuing basis. We throw into our reading skills clinic 30, 40, 50, 100 students, who they might not have seen otherwise, and we force them to employ additional staff, to run additional sections, to develop new and different approaches to deal with reading problems in that they tell us that these kids have reading problems that even they have never seen before.

We know what the expenses are, after a painful period. We still do not know who is going to bear them.

Going back to our recruiting program, we sometimes find ourselves un-recruiting students. One of the problems that we have encountered is the over-enthusiasm that some of the people who are feeding these students to us have caused, and this is a real pressure on us.

We find students with the wrong educational goal. We find kids who want to be bookkeepers, thinking that they should enroll in our business administration, accounting program. We find girls who would like to be medical technologists or perhaps receptionists in doctors' offices, wanting to register in pre-medical curriculae.

We also find students who are at the wrong institution. We find kids who rightfully should spend two, maybe even three years in a junior college, applying to a senior college in a rather technical, demanding curriculum, as Jack pointed out.

We find that we are receiving applications from a large number of students who are not qualified for our institution, and who, in many cases, are not qualified for any institution.

There comes to mind the case of a young man I talked to in one of the most deprived high schools in Detroit, who spoke very verbally and very lucidly about his ambition to become a psychoanalyst, and we got his high school record out, and he had a stunning 1.5 high school grade average. Yet this was a student who had been identified, motivated, and almost recruited to attend college.

So we find that there is a lot of pressure in

directing students appropriately to their educational and intellectual needs.

We also find that in the secondary schools we have a pressure which results from segregation of poor kids. It is one thing that we have had to work very diligently to overcome, and one of the problems -- as I think Jack has found in working with these students -- is that they are different from the normal population on our campus, and this presents them with some real psychological problems.

So we have the problem of reducing, as far as possible, their identification, their segregation, as somewhat different from the rest of our students.

We also have problems in developing our student budgets, in finding out what the need is that we have to meet. Jim touched on this briefly. It is something that I think we need to think more about.

The students that we find in the college work-study program are not students for whom our typical budget applies. The biggest problem that we find with them is that of lost earnings, as Jim pointed out. These are kids from families where the father says, on high school graduation, "You go out and find a job and you contribute to the income of this family."

We think this is an unreasonable attitude, and sometimes the kids do, but it is difficult for a student from a deprived educational background, even if we can bring him to our campus, to eat three square meals a day, and to sleep in a nice soft bed, and have his linen changed weekly, when he knows that his younger brothers and sisters are at home, in some cases going without food, in many cases going without food, sleeping three and four in a bed, and five or six in a room, and having their linen changed only when it is warm enough to do it comfortably.

We find that it is necessary in many cases, if these students are to stay on campus, if they are to continue their motivation, to provide payments for room and board at home. There is precedent for this in the economic opportunities act, the job corps training program, which is established also under Title I, the same title as the work-study program. It provides that participants in the job corps can send home -- is it \$25.00, Jim? -- \$25.00 a month they can send home to their families. If they do this, the federal government will match this, and will also send \$25.00 a month home to the families. So the government is aware of it. They did not put it in this particular piece of legislation, but it is a real problem for us in dealing with the students.

We find that we have unusual needs in other areas.

Their wardrobes are generally completely inadequate for the most casual of campuses. As I mentioned earlier, they need remedial medical and dental care. If we wish to have them participate fully in the on-going life of campus, we need to provide them with somewhat higher allocations for recreation and personal expenses.

Dean Williamson spoke this morning about students in a junior college in California wondering whether it was the role of the institution to develop some taste. We think this is very important, particularly with these low income students, that we do help them to develop taste, if you will, to make it possible for them to attend the concerts, the lectures, the art exhibits, the other civic, cultural, social activities that occur on our campus, if we are to overcome their previous educational and cultural disadvantage.

We also find that we have problems in explaining our budgets to them. They do not understand what it means. We have problems in discussing with them what is a reasonable and what is an unreasonable expenditure. One of our work-study kids, with her first paycheck, went home and bought a complete new wardrobe for her younger sister. This is very nice, and the younger sister needed it, but it kind of shoots the budget to hell when you pull \$50.00 out of the first paycheck.

We have had to explain to them about bank accounts. They have never had a bank account. Their families have never had a bank account. They do not know what a check is. They probably never have seen one.

We also have problems in developing a package, and Jim spoke to this earlier. I do not know what more needs to be said about it.

These students typically do not like indebtedness. One of our work-study kids, we ran into a bind, and our first paycheck was delayed two weeks, and we made an advance to our college work-study program students to pay their expenses during this two week period when we didn't give them a paycheck. One of the kids refused to take the advance because she found out she would have to pay it back. When she got her paycheck she would have to give me back that \$50.00. I do not know how that girl survived for two weeks, but she did it. But she would not even accept a \$50.00 debt when she would have to guarantee that she would have a source to repay it.

Yet we talk about saddling these students in their first year with \$500 to \$600 in National Defense Loan indebtedness.

We also have the problem that these students in many instances are not capable of maintaining the employment

level that we specify for them, even fifteen hours a week. Of the twelve January high school graduates that we brought into the college work-study program, four already have indicated that they do not believe that they can work while they are going to school. We concur in their decision. We wonder whether the other eight are going to be able to carry it.

I fully expect that at mid-semester we are going to have to make some real adjustment in the number of hours that these kids are working. This means that the institution must come up with the money from some other source -- if not loan, then scholarship.

So the \$2,000.00 differential that Jim spoke of earlier may rise, and may become \$2400.00, \$2500.00, or \$2600.00.

The students also have the problem of maintaining an employment level which detracts from their personal adjustment to the campus. This is something that we have to be concerned about, and it is a real pressure on us because with each adjustment that we or they make in their budget, the effect is to increase the institutional commitment of funds to these students.

To try to summarize this rather rambling participation in the discussion of the pressures that the financial aid officer has to face, I can only agree with Vic Yanitelli in his address last night that we must get the "personal" back in student personnel administration, and if these programs are to succeed, it requires a deep commitment, a deep personal commitment by the institution, but primarily by the student personnel administrators, by the financial aid officer, by the admissions officer, by the counseling and testing, the guidance director, to provide the continuous, personal and demanding services that these kids have to have if they are going to succeed.

It also requires -- and perhaps this is more important -- a commitment from the dean or vice president for student affairs, to provide the financial support to the service areas necessary for them to carry on the job, because it is only with this personal commitment that we, at the operating level, can assume our role in providing higher education for the educationally and culturally deprived. It is only with the support of our superiors that we can do the job that we would like to do.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. JAMES L. MOORE (U. S. Office of Education): My assignment is that of "mopping up." This is what we spend most of our time doing in the Office of Education these days after a typical day's activity with 29 phone calls every hour, "Where's the money?" Or "Why did you

issue that silly sort of regulation?"

I really do not have too much to say, because the comments made by your preceding speakers certainly hit a number of nails right squarely on the head.

I rather like the way Bill closed with this notion of commitment on behalf of the institution because I think, as you can all see, this is today, in this very rapidly expanding financial aid area, I think the first question that every college has before it, and the question it must answer before it begins to move into these new programs.

I talked last fall in a meeting such as this to representatives of probably 100, or nearly 100, fairly high cost private colleges on the east coast. This was before anything had been issued on the work-study program. I spent most of my time telling these people in very plain English that they had better go home and give a little hard thought to this program before they jumped into it this year, because, as Jim Bowman pointed out, there are some real problems from a dollar standpoint in trying to fix on the primary purpose of the work-study program in a high cost institution.

I think this is borne out by the participation rates that seem ahead of us for the summer. We began in the middle of the year with approximately 700 institutions, of which some 665 are presently operating programs. That figure has increased to just over 1,000 for the summer, and it looks as though, with this second round of applications in May, we may get to 1,100. This is about half the colleges in the country.

If you examine the list of participating institutions, the first fact that hits you right between the eyes is that the participation rates of public and private schools are exactly the reverse of the numbers of private and public institutions in the United States.

We are hopeful that the scholarship program will go a long way toward putting on what Frank Keppel calls the third leg of our three-legged stool, and easing the dollar problem as far as the private schools are concerned.

There are a couple of other points, and then I would simply stop and ask for questions of the panelists here or of the federal government, if I can answer them this afternoon. When you are involved, as I have been over the last few years, in the design and operation of these programs, you are continually confronted with the oftentimes apparent conflict between what is good public policy, or what seems to be good public policy, and the obvious problems that a given institution or a group of institutions will have in operating under that sort of policy.

Being a great nation of compromisers and workers in the democratic process, you hunt for the golden mean, or the middle of the road, as it were, that you hope will work equally well in both areas.

A number of people have said that the NDEA loan program, if it did nothing else, has stimulated borrowing in this country. Whether that is good or bad, I will leave to other speakers.

The fact of the matter is that it appears that in the past six years that it has literally caused a revolution in the lending habits, as far as institutions are concerned; primarily, in terms of converting existing programs to low, or no-interest rates, and this somewhat extended repayment period.

The work program, I think, may have a similar affect in increasing compensation levels in a number of colleges, where they begin to bear a little more reasonable relationship to the cost of going to college. You begin to plow around in this work area, and begin to look at what has happened in institutions over the last, say, twenty years, and you will find that in numbers of places pay rates are still pretty much what they were in the early fifties. I have found some that have not changed since Pearl Harbor. The same pay rates. In fact, they switched right over from the NYA, I think, into this program.

Now, there are many reasons for that, and I do not have to go into all of them. Some of them, as you know, stem from the fact that this is a captive labor market, and the student does not work anywhere else, but for the institution itself, and if you can get him for thirty cents an hour, you jolly well get him for thirty cents an hour.

I raise that point because when you see administrative memorandum No. 4, which is now circulating to a few select institutions in the country, and it talks about \$1.25 as a base wage, this should not be interpreted wholly as a result of certain decisions around here at various levels with our friends up at the Teamsters' building and other places, but rather it reflects the interest here in moving a general wage pattern up to a point where you can get enough money into the hands of these kids, which is really, as somebody said, the basic purpose of a financial aid program.

Finally, I come back again to Bill's use of the term commitment. Increasingly, the entire institution is involved in these things. It is just not a matter of the business manager any more, or the dean, or the financial aid officer, or the president. It is everybody.

Here and there in our regulations, and even in the statutes that are now in draft form, we hope you will find

some little subtle hints that this is probably a good thing, to broaden the concern for these programs and these kids, to include everybody in the country.

The growing pains that you are in in the work-study program right now are a direct result of this part of the economic opportunity act being developed more quickly, more skillfully than any other part of it, simply because you people in the colleges are knowledgeable about running these programs. You know how to pick up something in the middle of the second inning of the ball game and go ahead with it. It is running miraculously well with practically no instructions. We may leave it that way for awhile and see what happens. (Laughter)

But this is true, so when you find, as Bill went down this whole list of problems, sure, everybody knows they are there, except some of the more naive souls who last year, in the dreaming stage, talked very seriously about some of the kinds of kids that Bill Van Dusen described coming into college on Monday and being sent right back into the neighborhood on Tuesday as fullfledged tutors running their own remedial programs.

I am not sure what kind of plant hormones they were using in the spinach when they came up with this sort of idea. It is totally unrealistic. Something like this might happen over three years, but not overnight.

The point of the story is that this is the kind of thing that people expect of America's colleges, that you can in fact take these people out of homes where they sleep five in a bed, and in three or four years literally turn them into the kind of a citizen and person that never would have been the case otherwise.

It is not easy. In fact, it is awfully difficult, and if you scream like the dickens for a 20 percent administrative overhead, you will get all kinds of help from me, because I certainly think that is part of this kind of responsibility.

We have great hopes over the next sixty days of seeing the Congress do some things with the higher education bill, now that the elementary-secondary bill has pretty well cleared the desk. What happens, no one really knows yet. Keep your fingers crossed. Come down and testify, and maybe we will be here again next year screaming about the scholarship program. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Well, I am very pleased and somewhat surprised that three members of the panel could spend a weekend at Nassau and achieve so much preparation, and I do thank you. Jim, I am very happy with your contribution. There is a question I would like to ask you, and it relates

to our experience with identification and recruitment.

Section 408 of HR-3220, as introduced by Mr. Powell, provides for contracts up to \$100,000 a year, groups of institutions are specified, where feasible.

Now, does that indicate that -- if we look out the window real carefully -- help is on the way?

MR. MOORE: Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: That is the intent?

MR. MOORE: That is the idea behind it.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Because Section 407-B, if I am not mistaken, has that little 5 percent administrative charge such as goes along with CWS.

MR. MOORE: That is right. I think two things will happen on this cost thing this year. The Congress is more than just a little bit interested in the NDEA at this point, and I do not have to tell you why. There are some difficulties here and there. That is not, in some respects, perfect legislation. Consequently, these committees and their staff people are earnestly seeking advice and counsel at this point as to ways of improving the program, to make it easier for you people to operate, and I guess keep all of you from having to spend all of your time as skip tracers, you know, or credit investigators, or what have you.

One of the obvious suggestions is some administrative cost relief in the loan program, and this may well be part of the items that are finally considered.

The 5 percent on work-study, well, I just do not know at this point what may happen to it. The program is still too new and at this point in time very little activity is off campus. Now if there is 5 percent over-ride on the scholarship program, ultimately, if you put all of these together, and an institution is involved in a fairly sizable package approach here, you may find the federal share of this enough to begin to staff it, at least at minimal levels, in the institution, and to quit robbing other parts of your budget, and other echelons in your staff to supervise the program.

I think it is fair to say that as compared with '58 the thinking in Congress has changed radically in terms of these financial aid programs, and the fact that it does cost money to run them, and that you just cannot go on forever expecting people to absorb it.

... General discussion ensued ...

SEMINAR
"Student Demonstrations"
Monday - April 5, 1965

The seminar convened at three-thirty o'clock, James M. Lavin, Dean of Student Affairs, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio, presiding.

CHAIRMAN LAVIN: This seminar centers on "Student Demonstrations. Needless to say, this topic is very timely. It is a topic that has received much attention, not only from among ourselves, but it certainly has received much attention and interest in all mass communication, and I certainly would agree with Dr. Hugh Borton, President of Haverford College, who spoke this afternoon at the luncheon for small colleges, when he said that this morning you could feel the tension amongst ourselves when an announcement was made that someone should call his home school, and the pitter patter of the hearts of many started to tick, "Well, I wonder if it is me this time."

In his discussion Dr. Borton indicated that we have to face the fact that campus unrest exists and will increase in the future; that there have been varying demonstrations on many campuses; and that this is an age of demonstrations and protests in which personal involvement is a distinctive mark.

Now, many of us might have a tendency to sit back and say, "Well, it is happening out west," or down south, or east, or in another part of the country, and we hear about the various demonstrations that take place which receive national attention.

I think all of us, although we have been hearing an awful lot about civil rights demonstrations, and so forth, realize that there have been a lot of demonstrations on our campuses, ranging from subjects on tuition, ROTC, grades, food service, housing, general university policies, health service, faculty hiring and firing, parking, and so forth. I think none of us can say it is not going to happen on our campus. Some look upon it as a healthy environment.

Today we are very fortunate in having with us a speaker who is well versed on the subject. He is Professor Pollitt. He is presently a professor of law at the University of North Carolina, in Chapel Hill. This year he is a visiting professor at the University of Oregon.

Professor Pollitt received his A.B. degree from Wesleyan University and his LL.B. degree from Cornell. He practiced five years before entering the teaching profession. He has been on the law faculty at the University of Arkansas, and he has been on the faculty at the University of North Carolina since 1957.

He has served as a special consultant to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. Professor Pollitt teaches courses in constitutional law, civil rights, labor law, and Federal jurisdiction. He is the author of numerous articles. Articles pertinent to this discussion are an article in Esquire entitled "The New Breed of Students;" an article in the Duke Law Review on "Dime Store Demonstrations;" an article in the North Carolina Law Review on academic freedom and the "Gag law;" and in last August's issue in Harpers there was an article on the right to counsel.

Professor Pollitt is a member of the initial Committee "S," and at the University of North Carolina he is the faculty adviser to the student NAACP.

It is my pleasure to introduce Professor Pollitt, the speaker of the seminar. (Applause)

PROFESSOR DANIEL H. POLLITT (Professor of Law, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon): It is a great pleasure to be here, which is what I said the last time I felt this way, which was when I addressed a group of police chiefs on the law of arrest; and it is a great trepidation to appear before Deans. I had a very healthy respect for my own dean when I was an undergraduate and I tried to keep that healthy respect by dodging down an alley whenever I saw him coming.

Since my undergraduate days my approach toward deans has softened through the contact I have had on a more adult relationship, and I have come to know deans as humane, kindly, interested, concerned, and fond of their students.

We in the academic world also have an appreciation of students, an interest, a concern, and a fondness.

So I am very pleased to share with you people some of my thoughts, and I am sure that I, too, will benefit by the exchange which will follow.

I was asked to give a talk on student demonstrations and I was told to keep it short, but unfortunately, I speak only in 50-minute time blocks. I will try to keep it short, but that 50-minute time block sort of thing is something which is imbued in all professors.

I was just thinking that it was about five or six years ago that I did write an article in Esquire on the new breed, and that student apathy was the problem then.

Six years ago had we talked about student demonstrations, we would have talked about the Japanese snake chains, protesting the Eisenhower good will trip to Japan; or we would have talked about the student hate in Latin America, which was demonstrated when Vice President Nixon went on the good will mission there.

Abroad the student demonstration is traditional; we are used to it; and it continues. In Moscow the students turn out to throw ink wells at the American embassy. The only newsworthy item of late is that the police interfered with the Oriental students and the result was the Chinese students turned out in Peking and threw ink wells at the Russian embassy.

But all over the world, in Cairo and Jakarta we are used to student demonstrations. While the San Francisco, Berkeley demonstration was going on, there was a counterpart in Buenos Aires which was precipitated when Walt Rostow of our State Department went down to give a talk on the American policy in Vietnam, and the students there showed displeasure by throwing eggs and vegetables, catcalls, and other forms of demonstrations, and the result was the removal of the Rector of the 25,000-student university.

I think the only thing amazing abroad is the recent demonstrations which took place in Spain, where thousands of students marched, sat-in, and petitioned to protest the lack of internal self-government. They wanted to have more say in their own affairs.

But here in America we are not used to demonstrations. Briefly, oversimplifying, to give some historical context, in the 1920's, as I understand it, it was the "kootch," and the Tin Lizzy and the coonskin coat, and football games, and the fraternity dance. I am sure that is an oversimplification but that was, as I understand, the student interest in the 1920's.

In the 1930's, with the depression, the students grew more serious, but they also grew doctrinaire, intense--small groups sitting up until the early morning hours arguing which brand of Marxism is correct and scientific. There was an Oxford Pledge some students signed stating they would never go to war; and at Vassar around 1936 the co-eds burned their silk stockings to protest the Japanese invasion of Manchukuo, but by and large, the students in the thirties rarely left the campus.

As we approached World War II the news from the campuses about the students concerned their ability to swallow live goldfish.

In the 1940's the campuses were staffed by the V-12 and the V-7's and the army programs. The student was in uniform by and large, and he was in a crash program to acquire as much knowledge as possible in the shortest time possible.

Then when World War II ended we had a new phenomenon on the college campus, the veteran. He was older, he was married, he was more mature. His interests were to make up for lost time, take the kid for a walk on Sundays, try to see his wife occasionally, and get through with as high grades as

possible. So we had a new change with the veteran in the late forties.

The veteran then gave way to the generation we all deplored. In the early 1950's we had the silent generation, the conformist generation of students. You could not get them excited about anything, for fear -- for a legitimate fear possibly -- that any political, social, economic action would result in their being called before the McCarthy Committee or would jeopardize their chances for government employment. So in the early 1950's there was the silent, apathetic student generation which gave vent on occasional spring evenings to the "panty raid" which was introduced at that time, plus the spring fever which took them to Ft. Lauderdale and Daytona Beach, and to the Newport jazz sessions, and subsequently to the Labor Day vacation spots the country over. This was a generation we were all concerned about.

Then we got the beatniks. They were withdrawn, they were introspective. They were trying to prove their identity through different types of face -- they wore beards, wore their hair long, or went barefooted or wore sandals.

Then we had a new or current phase that started in the 1960's. It started on February 1, 1960, in Greensboro, North Carolina, when three freshmen at North Carolina A & T College went into a dime store and sat down at the counter and asked for a cup of coffee. They did not get a cup of coffee, but they stayed until the day was over, and when they went back to their campus their classmates said, "What are you doing?" The next day they had 25 or 30. The third day they had 150, with people picketing outside. That was the start of the sit-in movement which spread all over the state, then all over the south, and then all over the nation, as students started to picket and petition and to sit-in, to express a dissatisfaction with the existing racial situation in so much of the country.

In a series of Supreme Court decisions these students won the right to march in large numbers on the State House, to show the governor and the legislature that they were not happy, and when they won these rights, these rights were exercised.

They had new heroes. John F. Kennedy was a great hero on the college campus. J. D. Salinger, James Baldwin, Martin Luther King, Barry Goldwater -- these were the new heroes.

There were new organizations of which we had never heard: SNCC, NSA started to revitalize, the Northern Student movement, the Student Peace movement, the Young Americans for Freedom, and we have the W.E.B. DuBois clubs and other organizations which have become articulate on and off

campuses, and their new activities -- tutorial programs sprang up, the one-to-one situations, where students have given very generously of their time to try to tutor the socially and economically unfortunate youth so that he can prepare himself for something better.

Then hundreds of students went to COFO, which we would not have known about this time last year, but which now we all know about. They went to COFO in Mississippi to work in the voter demonstration and voter educational projects.

We had three big activities since 1960. We had the COFO movement in Mississippi last summer. We had the demonstration in San Francisco against HUAC, which is another new term -- they used to call it the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We had another peace march during the spring vacation three years ago when it turned cold and started to sleet, and President Kennedy sent coffee out to the thousands of students who were picketing the White House.

The students have now reached a new level of social, economic and political maturity, and they are exercising their rights to express themselves.

This year we have Berkeley, and I do not intend to say anything more about Berkeley, because everyone else has expressed their views on Berkeley, and everyone is now an expert on Berkeley. Berkeley was marked, I think, by the sit-in at the administration office.

But Berkeley was not the only institution where there were sit-ins. At the University of Kansas very recently a hundred or more students sat-in at the Chancellor's office to protest racial discrimination in the fraternities and in the off-campus housing. The Chancellor closed the office at five or five-thirty. The students refused to leave. They were all arrested and suspended from the university. The following day there were 250 students sitting at the Chancellor's office. The Chancellor negotiated. Everybody was reinstated, criminal charges were withdrawn and there is now a committee established to look into the problem.

Another odd thing about Kansas is that we have football players participating in these events. All-American halfback Gale Sayres was a leader of this revolt. He explained that his younger brother might come there, and that when his brother came he hoped his brother would be as free as he wanted to be.

There was also a sit-in at Paterson State College in Wayne, New Jersey. There the students had gone through the regularized procedures. They had petitioned the administration asking for the right to establish some political

and some religious and some social organizations, and their petition brought them naught, so they sat-in, in the President's office. The seven were suspended, but subsequently reinstated.

But the sit-in in the Chancellor's office is still a unique institution. More normally you have what we have had at the University of Oregon ~~this~~ year. There has been off campus picketing.

The Subversive Activities Control Board came to Portland to see whether the leader of the State Communist Party should be listed and forced to register under the Subversive Activities Control Board. There were students from the University of Oregon and from Reed College and Portland State University who picketed the hearings. There was a smaller group from the same universities who picketed the picketers.

Then as the Vietnam situation escalated, there were at the Student Union two rival tables where you could sign your name to telegrams to the President, one group protesting and the other encouraging the President with his action.

Then there was a march, on a Saturday, meeting at noon at the Student Union, marching through the campus to the downtown park where there would be speeches; and there were two groups, one on each side of the street, headed for different sides of the park. One group "Better dead than Red," and the other one "Negotiate -- don't bomb," and so on. This is typical of what is going on in many campuses.

There is one demonstration in Oregon that I think we can all applaud. It is the new type of demonstration. During the spring vacation a fairly large group of students went out to restore the flood-ravaged migrant farm labor camps, to prepare them -- painting, fixing them up -- for the farm workers who were to come; which is somewhat similar to another good student demonstration, and I am referring here to the Oberlin students who spent their Christmas vacation rebuilding a bombed-out church in Ripley, Mississippi.

The students are interested in a great variety of things, and they are utilizing a great variety of techniques. I will just give you some headlines which are out of the New York Times in the last couple of months.

At the University of North Dakota the student body president carried a student petition asking the faculty to end compulsory ROTC. This was the normal petitioning route by the president of the student body.

In Utah there is a student picket line, headed by their Negro football star who had been drafted by the Chargers, picketing the Mormon headquarters protesting racial discrimination within the state.

At Sarah Lawrence the girls marched to protest police brutality in a local hospital strike.

At Bronx College the students picketed -- 2400 of them -- to protest an increase in tuition.

At Oklahoma State University the students picketed the graduation ceremony where Senator Ellender was to accept an honorary degree. They were protesting Senator Ellender's threat to filibuster the voting rights bill. The sign said, "Prejudice is not honorable -- no degree." The consequence of their picketing was that Senator Ellender received his degree in a hotel room.

At Kings Point in New York they have a more traditional objective: better food. The midshipmen at the Merchant Marine Academy went on a one-day hunger strike protesting the food, although the vending machines did very well. (Laughter)

At Oberlin, at approximately the same time, the students went on what they called a "fast" and the fast was to protest the United States policy in Vietnam.

This, too, is a new technique, the public fast. We had it in North Carolina last year during the week between Palm Sunday and Easter, when seven students sat on the lawn at the courthouse and did not eat for a week.

Fairleigh Dickinson in New Jersey -- this is a headline which said "1500 march in expression of general discontent." There general discontent stems from four main causes. One of them, traditional, was a desire that the student editors receive some sort of payment for their work. Another one was lack of direct communication between the student body and the university trustees, which is somewhat unique. They also -- and this will give you pleasure -- they protested the plans of the university to abolish the post of the Student Activities Director. This gives me pleasure: They protested the refusal of the university to give notice to the professors who were discharged.

This is something, to my knowledge, which is new, the student concern for their professor. As far as I can tell, it started, as many things do, at Harvard. The publish or perish controversy -- four popular young instructors in the religious department were denied tenure because they had not published sufficiently. Harvard Crimson gave this story: 200 Harvard students staged an angry rally recently to protest the dismissal of several popular instructors. The instructors were asked to leave the university for failing to meet departmental requirements of scholarly publication. The controversy swirls about four teachers in the History of Religion Department, who have published little. One, an Assistant Professor, taught a popular course in

early Christianity, but wrote nothing. When questioned, the Professor said only, "They know not what they do." (Laughter)

Another instructor, a bearded expert in Jewish theology, had composed only ten sentences while at the University. Even these, the Department charged, were written by someone else.

The faculty also dismissed one of the department's more prolific members whose work included 95 theses. The public had complained that nailing these theses to the instructor's office door did not constitute an acceptable mode of scholarly publication. (Laughter)

Then again, as some of these things do, it went from Harvard down to Yale where the students picketed the administration building in an around-the clock drive to protest the denial of tenure to a popular young Professor of Philosophy. It is interesting that the faculty wives supplied the coffee at the early morning hours. And their signs were funny. They wanted "creative teaching, not publications," and they complained that the tenure rules as applied in that instance would have denied tenure to Aristotle and Kant.

Then it went from Harvard and Yale down to Brooklyn where it was a "perform or perish" situation, applied to a music instructor who was admittedly doing quite well in the classroom, but he had neither performed (conducted), nor engaged in creative research. The school newspaper had a protest and the student government council sent a letter of protest to the college president.

These are the more traditional techniques of voicing student concern.

Then a few weeks later at Brooklyn, a philosophy professor was released when he disaffirmed his loyalty oath, and over 500 students engaged in a five-hour vigil to protest his dismissal, urging the administration to come to his legal support.

Also in New York City a St. John's controversy began when the faculty asked for a voice in the policy decisions and also a voice in the salary fixing provisions, and the students came to their support. At both Queens and the Brooklyn campuses rallies of over 700 students supported the professors. While they were about it, they presented their own demands which were the right to form political clubs, the right to invite controversial speakers to the campus, and the right to have greater editorial freedom in the campus publications.

There was a situation at Stanford which I cannot understand from the press accounts. Apparently the students

wanted to protect the English professors from an alleged spy system which had been originated by the Dean of Women, to protect the freshmen girls from the erotic literature which allegedly was stressed by the young professors, and for ulterior purposes.

But these concerns by the students for the faculty are very welcome and very refreshing, but it is certainly not the prime concern of the students.

Civil rights is what the students are primarily interested in, as illustrated by the recent events connected with Selma.

Again, referring to headlines, "Beloit Students March." A group of 133 Beloit college students started a fifty mile march to Madison in sympathy with the fifty mile march in Selma. In Fordham, 1,000 students protest in sympathy with Selma.

So it went all over the country. I am sure you know what happened locally. In Philadelphia, a group of Penn students staged a sit-in at the Liberty Bell. There was a sit-in in Boston. In New Jersey, 1,000 Newark College students march. Then in South Orange, 200 Seaton Hall Students march five miles to Essex County Courthouse to protest. In Austin, Texas, the university students picketed the federal building. At San Antonio the students marched on the Alamo, where they had a prayer session.

At New Mexico there was a new device. The students had a 26-hour teach-in to protest the Selma situation. This teach-in, which just started a couple of weeks ago, has already spread to Michigan and to Columbia, so we may see the marathon evening teaching as a new device.

Many of the students left their campuses and went to Montgomery, and in Montgomery when the first march was turned back at Selma, they had a march in Montgomery and among the people who were injured and arrested there were 225 students from Pittsburgh, Michigan, Amherst, and many other northern and western institutions.

Some of them came here to Washington. About 150 students from the University of Minnesota, which was the largest group, joined the students from Brandeis and Harvard and elsewhere in a White House picket line.

So this is just a quick summary of what has been going on in the last couple of months.

Now, how do the college presidents react to this? They were asked in the survey which was discussed this morning, and generally speaking the college presidents permit it. They are quite permissive about this.

When it comes to picketing, 54 percent of the college presidents were permissive, 17 percent said they would not permit it, and 29 percent said they did not know, or they preferred not to comment.

Oddly enough, a greater percentage of college presidents favored or were permissive about the sit-in; 64 percent of the college presidents said they were permissive about sit-ins -- this was before anybody sat-in in a college president's office -- 64 percent said they would permit sit-ins, which included 72 percent of the presidents at southern Negro institutions; 16 percent of the presidents said they would not permit sit-ins, and this included a third of the presidents at southern white institutions. That leaves 20 percent who either did not know or who would not commit themselves.

So about one out of every six college presidents would not permit off campus picketing or sit-ins. Almost two out of three would permit it, and the others we do not know about.

Why are they permissive about this off-campus student action which is bound to make life difficult for them?

Well, President Dixon of Antioch College gave a reason which is set forth in the report. He said: "I think it is important to recognize that these activities are part of the total educational process that we have in our college, and that these are the young people who are going to be deeply involved in the political and social affairs of the next decade, that wise people believe that the problems of the next decade require us to develop leadership with sufficient courage to take positions and that one of the ways in which one learns how to do this is by doing it, and that there should be an opportunity in this educational situation to do this in a fashion which is, shall I say, somewhat experimental."

A lot of people think that President Dixon was wrong when he said these are the leaders of tomorrow. As you look at them, you do not think they are the leaders of tomorrow. But there is a very interesting article I happened to pick up in the San Francisco Chronicle during the height of the Berkeley riots. It was called, "Another Country, Another Student Strike."

The article talked about a student strike which occurred at the University of Toronto in 1894. At that time in Toronto the administration ran the whole thing. The students had no rights. The anathema to organized society was socialism and agnosticism.

So the students invited to the campus a speaker who was both a Socialist and an agnostic. To no one's great surprise, the administrators told the students that they could

not have the speaker appear on the campus. So the students did what was expected. They hired a private hall right off the campus. They had an overflow attendance. The first reaction of the administration was to expel the three students who had sponsored the meeting, which happened.

Then the students took up a scholarship fund, which was sufficient to give the expelled students enough money to go to the college of their choice, and they chose Stanford, and then the students had a student strike. They refused to attend classes. The government of Canada appointed a Royal Commission to look into the whole matter, and the upshot was that the Commission recommended -- and the university had to adopt -- a program where a university court would handle student discipline and that student societies and publications and meetings be left without interference by the administration, and that the administration of the university be placed entirely in the hands of a committee of the academic senate. Within fifteen years these and other similar proposals were adopted throughout Canada.

The interesting thing is that the three student leaders who had defied the administration, one of them died while at Stanford, and we do not know much about him. But the second one was Tommy Greenwood, as he was known, who later became Sir Hamar Greenwood, a member of Lloyd George's Cabinet in England. The third was Willie King, better known to us as the Right Honorable William Lyon MacKenzie King, the Prime Minister of Canada.

So it may be that Mario and the others will be sitting here complaining about student activities in the next twenty years.

That is a very brief resume of what is going on around the campuses, and I apologize for speaking at such length about a subject with which you are all so well acquainted.

I have not drawn any conclusions, but I would like to briefly suggest that the reason for this activity since 1960 is due to a number of factors, which are reflected throughout our whole society. Students reflect societal patterns; they are not unique.

Students generally, the current new breed, are larger than we were, they are handsomer than we were, they are more intelligent than we were, they are richer than we were. (Laughter) And they are selected through a strenuous winnowing-out process, and when they get there they have money for hondas or a trip to Montgomery, and apparently they are so selective that they find the faculty inadequate in many instances. We do not react to their needs, and they turn elsewhere.

They have done many things at high school that we did at college, so they have to go on to something new which leads to our astronauts and to our Peace Corps, and it also leads to a need to re-evaluate where we are and where we are going.

That is my message. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN LAVIN: Thank you, Professor Pollitt.

When one hears the various types of demonstrations and one can see that geographically it is all over, in many of our minds many questions can or do arise, such as, why do they happen? What percentage of our student bodies actually are participating?"

When they say "students from New Hampshire," or Penn or Pittsburgh, this could mean one student or two students. It does not mean 10,000 or 12,000. And when someone is demonstrating in Alabama, that does not mean they are demonstrating outside the president's office. We might all say, "That is fine and dandy, so long as they are down in Alabama." What do we do when they are at home? How do we react? Where is our student governing body?

These are some of the questions I have heard today from some of the gentlemen in the various sessions. What are the answers?

Professor Pollitt has consented to answer any questions that you might have. We ask that you stand up so everyone can hear the question, and give your name for the record.

DEAN WILLIAM R. BUTLER (Dean of Students, Ohio University, Athens): Can you speculate just for a moment about where we are going in view of the various patterns of activity that you have described here, focusing heavily on civil rights, moving over to some of the fringe areas of interest, as to the faculty and so on, in their problems.

What does this pattern suggest in terms of future kinds of student activity and some of the reactions that we might see from the colleges and universities?

PROFESSOR POLLITT: I would be only too happy to share the podium with anyone who would like to give an answer. My role was to raise the problems, not to give the solutions, which is a very happy role. So if anyone wants to add to anything I have to say, or to anticipate whatever I have to say, I would be only too happy. If someone else would care to comment, I would be glad to back this up. Maybe I could lead off.

Of course, my "lead off" is, no one knows. But

having said that, I think where we are going is that we are going to have a period of transition which will intensify for at least the next three or four years.

It is very hard to get into many of the colleges, and the students who come are extremely well prepared, and they are well heeled. They have been watching television and they have been reading books, and a lot of them have traveled. We cannot shunt them off to Daytona in the springtime. They want to do something in addition.

I think that their interests are going to become more and more varied, and they are going to want to express their interests in some way or another.

I think the student petition, the off campus march to support some cause or another, are going to become more and more frequent.

The problem which concerns all of us most intimately is the problem of the on-campus sit-in or the students staying away from the classroom. I think that happens when there is a breakdown of administration. For example -- I do not want to single out any institution because I do not know enough about any institutions other than my own -- at Fairleigh Dickinson there was a large protest, 1500 marched, "general discontent." One of their demands was for closer relationship with the board of trustees who were running the institution, "pulling the strings." They wanted to be able to communicate with the power structure.

At St. John's, which has been much in the newspaper, one of the demands was for more student control. They wanted to be able to run their own affairs, to establish their own clubs, and the whole thing.

There is a good deal of -- I do not want to say "monkey see, monkey do" because I do not want to imply in any way that students are monkeys -- but at Berkeley, which started off the whole thing this year, the demand was for their traditional rights to have their tables on the campus to solicit signatures and funds and bodies to go off campus to do things. And the inability to express their demands through any other way was what led to this irregular type of communication.

It is very hard to reach the president at most campuses. The president is the president of a "multi-versity," to use Clark Kerr's term. He is deluged with questionnaires such as we sent out to find out how he feels on student academic freedom. He is a busy man. He has to speak to the alumni. He has to speak to the trustees. He has to speak to the dads' club. He has to be on national committees, speak to Congress. He has to go abroad occasionally. They are very busy, and it is very hard for the

students to get to them. Sometimes the students feel the only way to get a grievance presented is to do something which is bound to catch everybody's attention, and that "something" is untraditional and bizarre.

I am reminded of the sit-down strikes in the thirties. The reason the unionists engaged in sit-down strikes was because the employers would not communicate and negotiate with the unions at all, and the sit-down strike was a technique to get to the bargaining table.

I think if there is no easy route to the bargaining table we will see the student protest movement take an unpleasant, ugly form, and I think the cure is the cure adopted in the National Labor Relations Act in the labor-management field, which is to encourage the techniques as processes of collective bargaining.

Student-faculty, student-administration relationships must be brought closer because the students obviously are dissatisfied. They want more voice in the sign-out hours, liquor in the fraternities, dances, curriculum, faculty appointments, and a whole gamut of things.

To guess, I think there is going to be in the future, in the immediate future -- us oldsters are not going to be willingly changing our ways. There is going to be pressure. We will change our ways, and the pressure will be taken off. That is what I see as to the on campus demonstrations.

As to on campus demonstrations for off campus situations, I see a continuation. Frankly, I would much rather see the students go to Selma than go to Daytona. I think it is a good thing.

Here is my dean -- the successor to the man I used to run away from. I rushed him when he was a freshman.

DEAN MARK BARLOW, JR. (Dean of the College, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut): I have not been aware of the history as you presented it, but it strikes me that once we get by some of the arbitrary rules and regulations, which I think we have lived with traditionally, and even some that might be called civil liberties for students, I sense that we are moving into an arena where the students are going to start taking on the faculty on educational matters.

I was reading a newspaper of an upstate, New York state college where they are organizing the undergraduates to avoid the large lecture course, to demand of the university that a man be permitted at least one seminar. And there are some peripheral things -- they do not like the

bookstores, and this got corrected very quickly; and they do not like the price of shirts at the university laundry.

Once they got these little irritations out of the way, they began to zero in on what I think are really very profound issues. As you say, the kids are getting brighter than we were. They are beginning to ask some very real questions about their own education, about "what am I going to get out of this four years?" and "How am I going to spend it?" "I do not want to spend four years being 500 feet from a man I can hardly see."

I would hazard a guess that this is where this thing is going to go, after we get rid of some of the other momentary harassing situations.

DEAN WARNER A. WICK (Dean of Students, University of Chicago): You raised some questions of defining methods that bother me a great deal.

I might say that Chicago was the first university, I believe, to enjoy the President's office sit-in. This was in 1962. We took the stand then -- and I am not sure we could get away with it now, or whether it would be advisable -- that we did not bargain with students, that the university society is not a civil society, that a method which works out in the great world with non-violent methods of bringing the attention of Congress to something, are not necessarily the appropriate methods for dealing in a university community.

We tried to draw this distinction between discussion of any question, which would be all right, any orderly form of protest was all right -- by this I mean, picket anywhere so long as you do not stop traffic; have mass meetings anywhere so long as you reserve the hall, and do things like that -- but you must not apply force that ties up the university mechanism.

Now, I think this would be a very desirable thing to establish, if you could. I think that the demonstration as a device to get to the conference table is an excellent thing, but you worried me a little bit when you drew the sit-down strike analogy of the thirties, because if the president of the student government becomes the recognized bargaining agent for the students, and he says, "Okay, boys, we'll pull them out," you are really not in a situation where discussion in the reasonable sense is possible.

I would like to add by way of history one point about our President's office sit-in. It was a civil rights case because it involved the university's practices in some commercial apartment houses that it ran, not for students or for staff. The national organization of CORE was rather heavily involved in this, and there were press

conferences and so forth, with James Farmer. So we were in a difficult position.

If we were dealing with Mr. Farmer and the national organization and it was part of the national plan to hit a big, liberal institution in the north, you would deal with them in one way; but if you were dealing with your own students who were really very much concerned with the moral issue involved in the university allowing discrimination in any of its operations, you would want to deal with them in a different way. We were seriously caught in the middle.

DEAN KARL KNOX (University of Illinois, Champaign): I would just like to follow up on one point which the speaker seemed to make as he alluded to some of these so-called demonstrations as being constructive and favorable.

There are many activities, I believe, on many of our campuses which are not particularly newsworthy from the standpoint of headlines, and yet they are remarkable in many, many ways. They are showing a manifestation of concern. I am talking about tutorial programs, where you may have 200 or 250 giving up two nights a week to work in impoverished areas of the community.

This particular point sort of followed Bill Butler's earlier question to you because, as you trace the development here and talk in terms of decades, it seems to be almost touching on fads, and then they went out because they became old hat, and new ones sort of came in to take their place.

Just last summer, in the little area where I happen to live, two days following the 4th of July, where there had been a sizable 4th of July parade, the little youngsters in the community -- and we have a very fine Negro family that lives a couple of doors from us. Their youngsters were involved in this -- eight or ten banging on pans, walking down the street, and the comment of the next door neighbor was, "What have you got, a 4th of July parade?" And he said, "Naw, we're picketing."

Well, when it comes to the point of where it relates to sort of cowboy and Indian affairs, I wonder if our news media is going to finally get to the point where other new gimmicks and attention attracting points will have to be devised.

You made reference to the new ones. Maybe you were inferring this.

PROFESSOR POLLITT: Yes. We had one in Eugene last week. The Junior High School students went down to picket city hall to protest the skate board ban. I am sure they would not have done that, had it not been for Berkeley.

I did use the word "encouraging" demonstrations. I am very much encouraged by the tutorial programs, by the church rebuilding programs, and the migrant farm workers home repair programs, and I think this illustrates the better part, or the best part we have in our college youth. But I am also afraid that these same students, the identical students who do this, are the students who are going to become very dissatisfied with sitting in a classroom watching the television speaker as the professor addresses 600 in the adjacent classroom. They are going to do what Dean Barlow pointed out. They are going to want a say in the curriculum and the faculty, and the size of the rooms and all the rest.

I think if we recognize that as a problem, then we will be able to devise techniques for coping with it. I think then we can very appropriately point out that what is good for labor-management is not necessarily good for student-faculty. But some comparable device for communication and understanding of grievances will have to be adopted.

DR. PHILLIP MONYPENNY (University of Illinois): I should like to comment on the situation which was presented at the University of Chicago, because I think this is far more general than is realized.

I remember just after I left Washington University back in 1938, the next year there was a strike of custodial workers on campus. The university refused to bargain with them. A number of students took to picket lines to help the protest.

Right now on our campus I know the active SNCC group is seeking ways of getting the university involved in the boycott of Alabama and Mississippi products.

My point is that students are in a very interesting situation. They do regard themselves, as I am sure the University of Chicago students did, as members of a community which is guided by a body of administrators. In certain areas they have the acknowledged right to participate. They do, however, get interested in other areas of the community's function. It may be in this use of off campus property, it may be in the kind of place where it buys its paper. They may not recognize the janitors' union. We do it now, but there was a time when we did not.

They get interested in these other questions. When they to deal with these other questions, they do run up against a bland willingness to listen to them but not to take them seriously. When one wants to talk to people, one does not want just the right to make a petition. He wants to feel some kind of mutual influence is being exerted in the process of discussion.

I think the sit-in kind of demonstration is a reflection of their feeling of inability to influence the university institution in areas which the administrators, or perhaps even the faculty regard should not be opened to this kind of bargaining, just as once employers were willing to talk on wages and hours, they were not going to talk about job classification and pension rights and conditions, and so on.

I do not know where you stop this sort of thing. Once people feel they are part of a community, you never know when they will feel the community's conduct is something in which they should have a part in deciding.

I do not think one can simply take the position that being willing to talk to people is necessarily all that the situation requires.

DEAN WILLIAM L. QUAY (Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania): Do you foresee any increased dialog between the American Association of University Professors and student leaders regarding questions of tenure and teaching load, the format of courses, curriculum development, salary increases, and the like; or do you think this is an ephemeral characteristic which we associate with the Yale demonstration, the Harvard demonstration, and so on?

PROFESSOR POLLITT: I do not think it will be limited to Yale and Harvard and Brooklyn, where it has been reported. I think it will go on. I think there will be a greater dialog between all elements of the university. The AAUP I assume will be the most representative group of faculty in discussing this, and then I think that the faculty councils will augment the student participation, and that it will have to be the student, the faculty and the administration sitting down together with the administration of course having the dominant position because they are the ones who are responsible, they have the greatest responsibility in these matters. But I do see a greater dialog coming in the years ahead, which will increase in scope and in breadth, and in subject matters -- matters which we in the faculty consider to be ours.

I was quite shocked at lunch to find out that students wanted to review the grading system. I am shocked, literally. And I assume that the University of Chicago was shocked when the students wanted to say how they should run their commercial ventures. But after nine or ten shocks, we will be numbed, (laughter) and give in, I suppose.

DEAN WICK (University of Chicago): Could I comment on that?

PROFESSOR POLLITT: I over-stated your position for humor.

DEAN WICK: I was not responding to that, because we were shocked.

This is really your question, Lehigh. We have had a case boiling up involving tenure of a faculty member who is popular. I wanted just to mention that it is not between the students and administration always, because this was a person -- the students did not know this at the time -- a person who was not being recommended for tenure, but that the department voted not to recommend him for tenure, and the dean of the division and the president's office simply had to say, "We have had no recommendation; therefore, go and talk to the department."

So the dialog between the AAUP and the students might break down, might have a little tension in it from time to time.

PROFESSOR POLLITT: I would like to add that at the University of Oregon now the students are adopting a rating program for professors. This is old hat at many institutions, but out there it is new, and the administration is quite happy to have the students rate the professors, but the professors don't like it. (Laughter) Not because we are against a rating system, but we are against any rating system except one which is perfect, and they haven't yet come up with a perfect rating system. So the dialog will be adverse on many issues.

DEAN BENJAMIN D. JAMES (Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania): There is an implication here that there is no line of demarcation between student rights and academic freedom. For instance, this question, what would the AAUP think of students making demands with regard to content of a course?

This is going to be a question that eventually is going to have to be resolved if we go on without a line of demarcation between student rights and academic freedom.

I, for one, would stand solely on the right of the professor to determine his own content of his own course,

DIRECTOR G. GORDON HENDERSON (Wheeling College, Wheeling, West Virginia): I am just wondering if the approach that we are taking toward all these marches and so on will have us pretty much on the defensive. Perhaps there is another approach, or part of our approach ought to be to take the initiative.

I cannot help but feel that with all this background of personnel services in general that we were forced into trying to get some sort of organizational structure, trying to get officers that would reach each individual student and the tremendous influx of students after the war

possibly brought it about. It seems to me, all these marches and so forth -- it is not the way in which we thought we might be going -- I think we are going to get more and more of this.

This is not a very reasoned approach to a solution of the problem on the part of the students, I do not think. On the other hand, I wonder if we have not, even with the large number of students we have, if we have not failed to keep our own faculties abreast. I have a colleague who has a very sneaky trick. He gets a leader, one of these boys who is about to lead a march or something like that, and he becomes very chummy with him, discusses the thing, and perhaps even has a little get-together with four or five others.

Actually I think what these students want is some forum where they can discuss these things. If they are more intelligent than we were -- and I think they are -- then I think they are more reasonable perhaps than we were, too.

This is pretty diffuse, but I think the solution may be just to try to focus the total personnel services in the university and try to let that seep down through to each individual member of the faculty, and take the initiative and try to seek out these leaders and give them fora to discuss these things.

If the president says, "I don't care if they sit in in my office," that may be very nice, but I do not think their sitting in the office, or their marching, and so forth is going to resolve anything.

If we can perhaps bring about a unification of all these personnel services, not only the Dean of Men, who must fit in, but all of the councils, and actually, if you are going to have an effective personnel program, every member of the faculty has to be in on it. If they are going to be in on it, I do think they are going to have to be kept informed in some way on some sort of plan.

I say it is a diffuse sort of thing. I wonder if we should not take more of the initiative than trying to cope with the results of these marches.

MR. PHILLIP SHERBURNE (National Student Association, Philadelphia): I think perhaps one thing that we ought to look at is why the students have resorted to the sort of means they have in order to achieve their objectives, using demonstrations. The reason used in the civil rights movement or women's suffrage movement, or anything else was to gain a bargaining position, where you not only had a forum, but your voice was going to carry some kind of impact on the position taken.

It seems to me as I traveled to campuses this year,

which has been about 80, and our staff has been to about 400, you get a real feeling from the students that they are very concerned about certain kinds of policies within the institutions. They do want to change certain policies that they consider irrelevant to their educational growth, or in some cases to change the academic structure where they feel they are not able to develop to their academic potential.

It seems that for so long, on the part of many of these student government people, there simply have not been any channels for effective communication and decision making. I know from being down in Berkeley and a number of other campuses, and from my own, that there is a kind of token participation, and there has been for a long time. You come in and you sit with the committee or the dean and we talk about your particular problem. Then we set up a committee to study it. Comes spring and you turn in the committee report, and the student leadership is gone. Comes next year, nothing really has happened.

I think the fact that the demonstration is being looked at as a legitimate and recognized means of attaining a negotiating position, and the fact that students recognize they have not been able to be much of an influence within the university, means that they are going to resort to the demonstration in order to achieve this bargaining position.

I think the man is right, that people can take the initiative to see that these demonstrations do not go on or are not injurious to the university. But it requires an honest desire to participate or have the students participate in the decision making of the university. If it takes place as it did at the University of Oregon last year, you are not going to have the problem of students demonstrating. I had continual access with the president of the University of Oregon.

This does not exist on most campuses, or at least the student body presidents or the individuals do not perceive it exists that way. The fact that they do now means they are going to use other means to achieve their ends, or that people outside the student government structures do not see the student government as a viable means of achieving their objective. So they will move into the president's office or into the street to see if they can't arrive at the bargaining table there.

I think your point about labor is well taken. Students at Berkeley are now considering having the student government go voluntarily and see if they cannot actually make a case to be protected under the LaGuardia Act so that students actually form a recognized union where they can strike. In students they have a closed shop so they can make all the students belong. (Laughter) This is extreme, but this is the way some people are thinking, simply because

they feel so ineffective within the existing university channels.

DEAN J. DON MARSH (Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan): I do not know whether this is peculiar to urban institutions, but I suspect it might be.

We are concerned about what we have labeled "Jack Hornerism," in this matter of demonstration and particularly in the area of civil rights. Those of you who are acquainted with Wayne State know that we have a tradition of very liberal thinking and actual encouragement of participation by the student body in matters politic, in terms of civic responsibility, but the thing that is disturbing us is that, being so accessible to a community beyond the university community, we are getting a tremendous array of non-student imports who, after the first successful and properly conducted demonstration where there is dialog as a result, such as, for example, a march upon the federal building -- not that I particularly like a march, but they did so in a fashion that did not interrupt vehicular traffic, they were courteous to those who were pedestrians and they were received favorably by the federal attorneys, who heard them out and responded to their requests, and all was fine and good.

But after about six such, which became attended by fewer and fewer legitimate students, and others operating under their banner, we are beginning to have all kinds of qualms every time that drum starts beating.

DEAN RAY B. LOESCHNER (Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka, Kansas): I would like to ask the student from Oregon, if we have any chance of having students demonstrate for such things, or demonstrate against cheating and immoral acts, and things like that. Is there any positive note in this direction?

PROFESSOR POLLITT: Yes. I think it was at St. Peter's in New Jersey. There was a hunger strike to protest unsportsmanlike conduct by a minority of the students at the college basketball game. So some students have demonstrated in the area of better student conduct. There has been that.

DEAN JAMES E. FOY (Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama): I would like to ask Professor Pollitt, does AAUP have a procedure set up, a recommended procedure, whereby students may protest unethical conduct of the faculty members, assigning grades, not living up to rules by examination, turning in examination papers, dismissing students for yelling in his class, etc. What do you have on that?

PROFESSOR POLLITT: A committee was created two or three years ago. It was created to deal with the problems of student academic freedom, and it is yet to make a final report. Professor Moneyppenny is the Chairman and he can

correct me on what I have to say, but one of the drafts went into this problem of student rights to appeal from arbitrary action by the professors. This was to incorporate into a code, a regularized procedure to protect the student from the arbitrary professor. That was in a printed draft which was circulated, and I believe that was the most controversial provision when it reached the faculties. Is it still in there, Professor Moneybenny?

PROFESSOR MONYPENNY: I think we watered down the statement considerably because of the criticism of the various chapters, and the question is still open. There is an area within which the administrators make the rules. We are proposing changing rules administrators make in a number of areas. This is one that is rather harder for us to move in than others.

Most institutions have shied away from that subject preferring to leave the man in the classroom autonomous in this area. I do not think, personally, that is quite good enough, but there are some problems when you move away from it to have an open review procedure. It is possible you can come around the back door with some type of general grievance committee. At the moment I might think that is the best way of making sure there is a procedure, even though it is not clearly labeled, for a review of unjust evaluation.

As to the institution, this is up to the administrators to make whatever rules they please. I think everyone knows the reasons for being extremely careful not to attempt to oversee the judgments of the man who is in the firing line in this particular situation.

CHAIRMAN LAVIN: Because of the time element, two more questions only.

DEAN WILLIAM B. CRAFTS (University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania): I know after talking with a number of our students who came back from the bus trip to Montgomery several weeks ago -- and we had quite a group that went down there -- it was certainly a very eye-opening experience for me, and I think it is fair to say that the students who went certainly benefitted greatly. This was an education they will never forget.

They were under constant stress for at least two days, some longer than that, because they were thrown in jail for up to six days or so. There was a constant threat of harassment from the officials and the local police down there. They lived in the Negro ghetto -- the only safe place apparently in Montgomery -- while they were there. They were very appreciative of the many fine efforts extended in their behalf by the Negro citizenry. But this was a lesson that they will never forget.

As I think of some of the scattered learnings that those of us on the campus have, it seems that we were impressed by the very liberal attitude on the part of those who went. These folks that went, our students, were on the whole not well inclined toward the administration, toward rules and regulations; in fact there were quite a few in that group who, quite aside from being driven by conscience to protest racial injustice in Montgomery, were, I think, very, very glad to tweak the nose of the administration and perhaps cause some embarrassment to the university. At least I would foresee actions in the future which might be of this nature.

But it seems like a very complex kind of thing, the reasons, the motivations why people would be swept up in this emotionalism which preceded these buses going off to Montgomery. It went just like that! The motivation shifted, apparently, while they were on route, while they were being trained for their part in the demonstrations down there, by SNCC; the motivation shifted under fire, under pressure. The motivation shifted on the way back. They shifted under pressure of responding, in the university community, to tell the students the reasons they went.

Many of our students, after they came back, were perhaps more set against civil rights activity of this kind than before the buses went. The neutral ones perhaps were not even budged in their thinking about civil rights, because of the actions of these students.

It is a tremendously complex thing. Maybe it needs to be approached and studied sociologically, as the Catholic priest mentioned this morning, as he recommended, for us to really understand the whys and the wherefores of this kind of thing, and what we do about it fully in order to govern and shape and direct to a certain extent what goes on here.

DEAN RICHARD A. CUNNINGHAM (West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia): I would like to premise my comments by stating that all is not peaceful on my campus by any means. But I have had some experience since 1959 in trying to work at the table of negotiation.

We do not have a student senate, and we do not have a faculty senate. We have a community form of government in which the faculty nominate and have the right to elect faculty representatives to the community government. There are four administrators, including the academic dean, the dean of students, dean of men and dean of women, and we are outnumbered two to one by students. We have a direct channel to the president.

It is true we are a small institution. We are more out of state than in, in terms of student population. But it is a table at which the students are able to discuss

with administrators, with faculty, many of these problems. We have gone through the barber shop issue without a public demonstration and solved the problem.

The students now elect representatives to the library committee, to the curriculum committee, to the administration committee, which hires and fires all staff and faculty personnel.

I think the negotiation table does work, and it is our responsibility to try to anticipate what the students are going to request in this situation. I think this is our great responsibility, to anticipate, in an effort to work out and deter some of it.

DEAN WILLIAM R. BUTLER (Ohio University, Athens, Ohio): I would like to go back to the original question I raised about trends in the future and so on.

There is one element I really have not touched upon that I have no answer to, but it only suggests an area, largely because of what happened at California, and that is the possibility of legislatures getting involved in control of universities and colleges, and what all this might mean for the future.

I certainly do not understand it at this point. I do not know that anyone in this room does. But I think the very fact that a number of bills are being introduced into the legislature at California, suggests control for the future, does suggest some new areas and new dimensions to the problem that we have not touched on here today.

I think these are some concerns we ought to be discussing in terms of where do you draw the line, and how much involvement are students going to have in the decision making process, and how all of this is going to emerge into an evolving kind of changing institutions from today to the year 2000 and so on.

CHAIRMAN LAVIN: I do not like to cut this off, but I must. May I thank Professor Pollitt for his coming, and especially thank you for your participation. (Applause)

... The seminar adjourned at five o'clock ...

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION
Monday - April 5, 1965

The Conference reconvened at eight-forty-five o'clock, Vice President Designate A. T. Brugger, Dean of Men, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, presiding.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am A. T. Brugger. I am from UCLA, and this is the first time I have had the privilege of addressing you. (Applause) Thank you, Father Vic.

I would add to this that on other occasions I was not this fortunate, and indeed only last June, it was not my first appearance before a student group, but since the last Chancellor and various deans were all sick, around May it fell to me to speak to the students at the Student Union.

One fine evening I walked up the stairs behind a very fine young man and his date. They were just about three steps ahead of me and they went into the Student Union. He turned to her and said, "You heard Brugger's last speech?" She turned to him and said, "I hope so, by god I hope so." (Laughter)

There are several announcements I have to make tonight. First of all, as you can see from the program, Dr. George Shuster will not be with us tonight. Like John Goldfarb, he went home. (Laughter) I am sorry, Father. However, his speech will be available to all of you at the registration desk tomorrow morning.

In view of these latest developments, following Professor Williamson's address we will break down into regional groups to discuss the report of this morning.

I think you all have, or should have this particular addendum to the program which gives the rooms and time of the various regional association meetings. I would like to say that if you have any particular friends in a region other than your own -- in fact, they need not even be friends -- please do not feel constrained to go to that particular meeting. You may go to any of these meeting rooms, and certainly you will be more than welcome.

The second thing is, in view of the many questions that have been raised about the proposed reorganization or restructuring of the Association, which will be one part of the business meeting tomorrow, there will be a session in this room at ten o'clock this evening, where the perpetrators of this dastardly scheme, your present executive committee, will be very happy to answer any questions that you may have.

I would like to reiterate at this point Father Yanitelli's thoughts, simply to say this, that this restruc-

turing is not an attempt to get your vote at all. We hope that all of you will be here so that you may question and quizz, argue, dispute, whatever you choose to do, so that tomorrow morning when we go into the business session all of us will be fully informed on what we are voting on.

Now, after all this--I am sorry to have delayed you, Dr. Williamson -- it falls to me to introduce Dean Williamson. Well, that is sort of like -- never mind.

Let me simply say this, that there is an old scientific principle which says that one proceeds from the known to the unknown, and in tonight's introduction I would like to reverse that principle and say we will go from the unknown to the known.

Dean Williamson. (Applause)

DEAN E. G. WILLIAMSON (Dean of Students, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota): Dean Brugger, your story about the wishful hope that this is my last speech reminds me of the incident when I was in high school trying to learn to play a coronet, as they called them in those days.

Every Friday afternoon we had some kind of an entertainment exercise, and they asked me to -- well, I guess I was instructed to play a coronet solo.

It was a pretty miserable performance, even by my own low standards. (Laughter) In the school Annual, out came the story, "What do you think of his execution? Well, I'm in favor of it." (Laughter)

Well, I am sorry that I am not my beloved George Shuster. I know that he regrets that he is not able to be with you.

I have his speech in front of me. I have tried all day long to follow out Tom Emmet's instructions to give you a precis, or excerpts from it, and it just won't break down. You have to read it, because if you know George Shuster, he has a beautiful style, beautiful ideology, and you simply cannot parse it, or excerpt it, so I am going to leave it with our friend here to reproduce for you. [See page 216]

It is a beautiful little essay on student life, and our potential role in influencing its outcome. He is my favorite essayist, and I am sure you will enjoy the beautiful flavor of his style, as well as his ideas, but I cannot excerpt it.

Sorry, Tom. So my remarks will be even briefer than anticipated.

Now I am sorry this morning that we crowded the program so much that there was no opportunity for you to react. I am sure that you had many questions, many critical appraisals and comments about the research design, the findings, the implications, unsolved questions, and the like.

I will remind you that this is the initial research investigation of an untouched field, as far as empirical research is concerned. I hope that it is the initiating study and that in the decades ahead there will be many serious research studies, and a great deal of thinking, as to the implications, philosophic and in terms of the higher learning and what we are trying to do to aid students to attain maturity of potentiality.

I would like to remind you also that in the April issue of the NASPA magazine the editor was kind enough to permit me to express my own personal evaluation of five alternative methods of dealing with controversy on the campus. I ended with my own favorite formula of a seminar, which term I used deliberately, to throw the emphasis upon rational thought about controversy.

If there is anything that distinguishes the higher learning in America it is that like the 18th Century period of enlightenment, we are trying to apply man's rational efforts to understand himself and his universe as a way of life, as a style of living, as a style of thinking.

As far as I am concerned personally, it does not make any difference how the seminar ends, if it ever does. Man's quest for understanding gives the real existential meaning to life, as far as I am concerned.

You will recall that Sir James Jeans said that it is better to travel hopefully than to arrive. And I think that this is characteristic of the way that an academic person would look at controversy. We are trying to examine it thoughtfully, and to be called thoughtful is perhaps one of the highest accolades that one can aspire for in the academic community -- to be thoughtful about life's many complex problems. Perhaps we will never solve them, but we travel hopefully, and it is this that gives the real value and meaning to the daily life.

Now you and I are practical administrators who must deal with controversy, never with an ordered, controlled curriculum, but with erupting phenomena. And it is a kind of exciting way of life, an exciting adaptation of the academic style of living, to see if we can engage our students in thoughtful and meaningful, and sincere conversation about the nature of the controversy.

I happen to think that the nature of academic freedom for students is one of those great, almost unsolvable,

problems which could keep the seminar continuing for years. I am quite aware of the fact that students want to come to conclusions; they are action motivated. They do not want to talk all the time, because to many of them conversation is an evasion of coming to conclusions.

I am not talking about this kind of academic verbiage. I am talking about the thoughtful, searching for the meaning. For example, as I said this morning, I happen to think that one of the essential philosophic underpinnings of the whole problem of academic freedom for students is the nature of the concept for freedom that students desire.

What is their concept of freedom? What is it they are going to think about? Do they recognize that there are alternative concepts of freedom which can be evaluated as relevant to their task of achieving maturity?

Now this afternoon, I am sure that those of you who heard President Gideonse became aware of the fact that there are many, many competing concepts of freedom which make sense out of controversy. And those of you who were in other sessions realize that this is not a simple problem. It is an extremely complex problem that you can devote years to studying thoughtfully, and you can help students learn the thoughtful approach to understanding and controlling controversy.

This method of the academic approach to controversy is in sharp contrast with the vituperative hate method of dealing with controversy that we observe so much in the community at large, where the individual who has differing ideas is hated rather than listened to. Surely we do not want to miss the opportunity of helping students learn to respect persons, even when they are wrong according to our point of view, with regard to their conclusions and with regard to their formulations of the issue and the problem.

Hate is the very antithesis of the academic approach to controversy, and surely this is our task as Deans. It is our opportunity to learn rich, alternative ways of helping students learn our academic style of controversy.

Now, since you had so little opportunity to raise questions as to practical applications of some of the facts that we reported this morning, it has been the decision of the establishment, namely O.D. and Tom, that you would be given an opportunity, by geographic regions, to discuss the practical solutions of the many, many problems, because John and I have not found solutions for you. We have simply tried to delineate and define the nature of the problems and the prevalence of freedom, and the prevalence of unfreedom. As you can see from the data, there are many, many unsolved and unresolved issues and problems. We have a good ten years work ahead of us to really bring the question of academic

freedom out into the open. I think you will be encouraged to know -- and I hope I am not premature in announcing this -- that the leaders of the National Student Association are trying to formulate a project, and to secure Foundation support, to begin conversations between Deans of Students, academic administrators, and student leaders on campuses and in regions, as well as nationally.

I happen to believe very sincerely that this kind of approach will yield rich dividends in trying to find ways of living with some of these questions that we cannot resolve at the present time, but which we must face in our daily lives.

So as you go into your regional discussion groups, I hope that you will be as practical as you wish to be, or as theoretical as you wish to be. I more and more have come to the conclusion that there is nothing quite as practical as a sound theory about human development, and particularly about higher learning. So try to formulate the issues and the questions and the unresolved problems that you face on your campuses, and I hope that you will give us, John and me, the benefit of any thought, any suggestion that you may come up with so that we may make this research report an effective instrumentality for bringing about change in the academic scene.

I am a reformer. I would like to think that we can bring the whole controversy about academic freedom under reasonable control, and rational control, by this kind of an approach, and that a few decades from now there will be a great deal of consensus, and a great body of knowledge which we can pass on to those who succeed.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Dean Williamson, we thank you. I in particular thank you. I have not had this opportunity personally to thank you for all the things you have done, but some eight years ago you hired away my boss, and I think that indeed was one of the finest things that I could thank you for. (Laughter)

... Announcement of regional meeting rooms ...

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Please remember, there will be another meeting here tonight at ten o'clock regarding the constitutional revisions, and I have Father Yanitelli's permission to say that short of an autodate, anything will go.

Thank you again.

... The Conference recessed at nine-five o'clock...

... Following is the paper submitted by Dr. George Shuster, Assistant to the President, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana:

FREEDOM THROUGH EDUCATION

DR. GEORGE SHUSTER: When I accepted the invitation to address you, Mario Savio had not yet deprived President Johnson of space in life, and I had not profited by the opportunity to read the reports of Commission VIII of your organization. No doubt -- and you will probably have anticipated this comment -- I was at the time tormented by a secret desire once again to be able to tell Deans, or as they are now called Student Personnel Administrators, how much what they are doing for and to students could be improved upon. I was likewise influenced by my admiration for Dean Williamson and the university he represents. This once fought a momentous six-day battle to permit me, a highly subversive character from New York, to speak on its campus. The battle was won and I spoke, though whether my doing so was worth all the carnage may well be considered doubtful.

Now having more or less done the homework expected of me, I find myself sandwiched between the so sorely stricken Multiuniversity and the Omniquuestionnaire. The story of the first is saddening. How could anyone have anticipated that a man of Clark Kerr's ability and humaneness would find it necessary to tender his resignation. The Omniquuestionnaire for its part relies on paradigms, medians and deviants to bare the academic soul naked unto its enemies. Nothing could be more awe-inspiring. Therefore it was particularly pleasant to discover on page 15 of Chapter XI a statement which indicates that the computer is, God be praised, not all-knowing. The results of this research, of which I am inordinately proud, will supply a handy text to which to append my remarks. The statement reads:

"No Catholic institutions, on the other hand, have permitted Wallace to speak on their campuses."

As a matter of fact, the Governor loomed up on the Notre Dame campus, still in some measure identified with the Catholic Church, on April 29, 1964, and I should like to describe briefly the ensuing events. What was implied in this invasion happened to be of some moment. The ethical teaching of the Church, to which this University is dedicated, frowns severely on racial discrimination, however true it may be that some of the faithful discriminate with gusto. It is also a fact that the President is a member of the Civil Rights Commission. For these reasons and others it could be anticipated that the U. S. Post Office would deliver a quantity of unappetizing epistles, and so it did. One of the deeply rooted convictions of the American people is that a college or university president will answer every letter anybody sends him, and that the more abusive any epistle is the

longer the reply will be. I do not know what Father Hesburgh did with all these because like every estimable Religious he keeps his hair shirts to himself.

Yes this is only part of the story. The desire to picket the Governor leaped from the manly bosoms which are the normal stock in trade of Notre Dame to the feminine ones of nearby St. Mary's college; and eventually the motley picket line included a bevy of young nuns who banded their placards with fervor. It was therefore from the pro-Wallace segment of the public that the heaviest barrage came. For had not the Governor been insulted and dealt with in a manner unbecoming his rank and station? When it was all over and the premises fumigated, I asked myself the question I so often put in the past: is this kind of thing worthwhile?

The university or college in each instance accedes to the wishes of a small group which of course could easily satisfy its craving for some given speaker's oratory by making a trip downtown. For most of a day or two it may well be that the normal process of learning ceases for quite a number of students, and of these days there are approximately two hundred annually each one of which is expensive at least for parents. What compensatory advantage has been gained? Except for some indefinable satisfaction which comes from performing a ritual of dissent, none that one can easily surmise. Students cannot of course be expected to care a whit about what happens to the public relations of presidents and deans. For them these august offices are identified with devices for keeping the lid on their youthful exuberance. Except, of course, when they are in some kind of trouble, which is often enough the case.

Even so I have long since come to the conclusion that when the rules of the game are well established the academic purpose is better served by permissiveness in situations of this kind than by opposition. Inviting and listening to campus speakers are symbolic, almost ritualistic, acts. Through them it is shown that the State, which in the deepest layer of citizenship consciousness in the United States is identifiable with whatever political Party is in power, cannot dictate to the academic establishment what it is to think, say or do. Like all ritual it should not be considered significant beyond the limits of its purpose. Competitive athletics are ritualistic, too. They are about all that is left in terms of the Multiuniversity of the Greek precept of "healthy body" except reading about it in Hemingway or Henri de Montherlant. But unlike the athletic ritual, the campus speaker one is educational only in the most limited sense. It can indeed, as I have indicated, be highly anti-educational. This is I think a necessary and salutary distinction.

For these reasons most of us have in our time fought more or less bloody battles for academic freedom. But it seems necessary in all fairness to observe that the ritualistic purpose is different on religiously oriented campuses.

These may indeed in some local situations be subject to political pressure of a limited though upon occasion erosive kind, but normally they are immune in terms of administration and finance. Their purpose rather is to help the religious orientation acquire intelligibility, relevance and effectiveness in terms of dual citizenship, one ecclesiastical and the other civic.

In the days of yore they often did so with evangelistic fervor. Then one could find that some institutions affiliated with Protestantism had little in the way of library resources except impressive displays of anti-Papal tracts, while certain of their Catholic counterparts gloried in commentaries on the Protocols of Zion. This now pretty generally belongs to the past. The freedom problem in terms of religiously administered institutions is one of assuring openness of mind in terms of religious discussion. Thus a minor epic might be written about the permissiveness extended or not extended to Professor Hans Kueng on Catholic campuses; and I can well understand why, as your Study indicates, having Cardinal Bea on the premises would be a hazardous innovation on some Protestant campuses. This the large public institutions should, it seems to me, understand. They can afford great latitude in sanctioning hostilities of assorted dimensions, even though few of them -- I may be permitted to remark in passing -- are at liberty to offer courses in Religion for credit. In general the State University can sanction the campus speaker ritual without endorsing its content. The religiously oriented university cannot divest itself of responsibility for that choice.

The campus publication problem is cognate, though the nuances are interesting. Of course the great university dailies of the Middle West are in this context entities in their own right. They live by the code of the mass media, they are responsible news gathering and news disseminating agencies, and in general their comment reflects professional standards. But in very many instances campus publications are little more than organs of self-perpetuating groups of youthful critics with an ingrained genius for annoying the administration, the faculty and the student body. The gift of the editor's wisdom is paid for by the institution presumably for the benefit of a captive audience. This action, too, has a symbolic, ritualistic significance. In some institutions the time of a good many people, including the President's, is spent trying to inculcate a measure of sweet reasonableness. But this is seldom the kind of condiment which a young man who thinks that the world is his oyster finds to his taste. At Hunter I told the editors that if they were sued for libel the burden of defense would be theirs, and that if they indulged in obscenity the paper would be closed down. This worked fairly well, though upon occasion irate targets for student comment failed to think so. But the ritualistic exercise was performed with weekly, monthly or annual precision, and the institution managed to survive.

But though importance attaches to these symbolic acts, which your Commission has reviewed with so much careful attention, they are perhaps now somewhat peripheral to our central concern. In the hope of making this relatively clear I shall juxtapose a small, candid picture of a South American university of a kind I have latterly come to know and of a trend in our own university life. The South American university is one in which the "ritual" indicated permeates the whole institution. A student organization manned by professionals (on some campuses it is legally possible to be a member of the academic community in quest of a degree for fifteen years) can bring the work of the university to a complete halt for months. Sit-down and other strikes are the order of the day, and the normal cause is some effort on the part of the faculty to raise academic standards by an inch or two. Even failure to award a passing grade to some well-entrenched student leader may halt classes. The campus speaker problem also emerges in a different context. It may take the form of a strike designed to prevent the Rector's extending an invitation to someone of whom the student organization disapproves. Of course this kind of turbulence has its roots in social and economic conditions which clamor for a remedy, though this is difficult to find. We cannot discuss them here. But probably no observer from this country has anxiously asked himself the question, "What would we do if we had to deal with that kind of situation?" In some South American institutions things are now a little better than they were, but in some others they are worse. In short, the ritual for expressing freedom there has come to dominate education radically and completely.

Now for a snapshot of our own scene. It is undeniable that the scientists have set themselves apart and have filled the two hundred days of the academic year so full of work and discipline that the students under their auspices are virtual recluses on the campus. Indeed, one may say that colleges of science and clerical seminaries are now the only two kinds of educational establishment in which rigor is all pervasive. It is the College of Liberal Arts or its equivalent in which the normal manifestations of the conflict between generations is currently observable. What precisely is the trend there? Dossier after dossier -- and what I say is based on them -- indicates that students feel more and more denuded of the humanness which alone can make the Humanities an educational experience. The instructor has seemingly come to feel that what he needs above all is some kind of Nobel Prize, too. The student has become more and more an object, to be tested and taught objectively. It is research which has become the instructor's subject, and he would like to do more and more of it with the assistance of larger and larger grants. And in his spare moments it is not his relationships with students he would like to perfect but rather his participation in the administration of the institution. Far too frequently his reason for doing so can be defined in quantitative terms. He seeks more benefits and perquisites, but

that he has any share in acquiring the financial means wherewith to make these possible does not frequently dawn on him.

To complete the portrait consider the Dean, or the Personnel Administrator. I have read with considerable assiduity what it is he or she has to say to students. Let me quote from one at random: "Congratulations from each of us on the faculty for the responsible way you handled yourselves and for this demonstration of concern." "The responsible way" is now the key phrase. It is true that some members of the faculty added that the students who thus proved their "responsibility" had missed "one or more classes." There is one wager which nobody in his right mind would make. The students who were thus demonstrating their "responsibility" were not preparing for careers in the Natural Sciences. Significantly enough, this is by and large true of Latin America as well. Let me add that the critique ought not to be one sided. It is no doubt regrettable that young scientists are too subordinated to specialization. And of course there are instructors in the Social Sciences and the Humanities who do dedicate themselves wholeheartedly to the enterprise of teaching and who are deeply respected by students for that reason. Indeed, one of my best friends who is also a person profoundly committed to making the university over which he presides a truly liberal institution, says that the one thing needful is the restoration of "Socratic concern" as the central purpose of humanistic education. This concern is everything else than dogmatic or restrictive. It is simply the mutual interest of students and their teachers in exploring the great, central problems of life as it must be lived in the society we inhabit if we are not to train a generation that is oriented solely to quantity, whether in terms of financial success or in any other terms, or to its biological function.

I think that until liberal education undergoes a reformation of purpose and method the position of what has traditionally been termed a Dean of Students is not going to be an enviable one.

Every young person worth his salt in the language of higher education is going to be in part an activist and in part a contemplative, in part a rebel and in part an arch-conservative. These are the four spokes in the wheel of the human personality and each of them is vitally needed. The difficulty is that the wheel may not go round so that one of the spokes may be on top for quite a while. Activism, for example, is likely to be dominant among our best college Juniors and Seniors. It is closely associated with that urge of the personality which is religiously motivated, even when there is no formal affiliation with religious establishments. To the consternation of the Academic Dean, a student's fancies turn to the Peace Corps, the Civil Rights movement, lay missionary activities. This upsurge of dedication may often coincide with the stirring of conviction

that the campus is dull, inert, and trivial. In like manner there will be rebels, the Shelleys of their generation, as well as those whose conservatism would make even the House of Lords seem a leftish institution.

After all, these young people are rather pathetically sandwiched in between the swaddling clothes of infancy and the later constraints of the job and family responsibilities. I think nothing illustrates this better than does an incident related by Harvard's Dr. Farnsworth. "My parents," said a very bright Freshman, "have always taken credit for everything I have accomplished. The only thing I can do now that is entirely my own is fail." And, the doctor added, "Fail he did."

The major glory of a Dean's office is that sometimes at least he or she can help bridge the gap between being young and being very young. And of course one must face the fact that there are some students on the campus who simply ought not to be there. Getting rid of them is painful but salutary surgery. Some Deans I know nurse the ugly ducklings with such loving care that they do not see that this ugliness is like contagious obesity.

If I may finally come to one recommendation and one observation my chore will be done. It seems to me that of the formulas which I have encountered for regulating student affairs the most successful is the joint Faculty Student Activities Committee. For its success it naturally requires some modicum of tradition and experience. When it has become a dependable organ of discussion, and when the student members have acquired the "responsibility" of which Deans are so fond, it can serve as an organ of institutional policy making with which, of course, the Administration will have to wrestle upon occasion but which will generally keep it abreast of campus sentiment which it cannot easily have any routine way of appreciating.

The educational administrative instrumentality we have developed in this country has many good qualities, but it does impose on the president a central obligation to exercise authority which as the size and the needs of his institution increase is almost more than any man can assume. I have often been impressed by the fact that whereas the college or in particular the university usually has awesome and costly instrumentalities for dealing with public relations in so far as the outside world is concerned its method of dealing with those selfsame relations within the institution itself may be primitive or what is appropriately termed old-fashioned.

We all realize that the appropriate method now is not hortatory but persuasive. There exists at present a deep and almost all-pervasive mood of rebelliousness against authority, which is rooted in social experiences we have not

yet studied in depth. It may be, for example, that it is in some measure a by-product of co-education which has now taken on a European university tinge, so that the discipline we used to assume was normative on campuses is now felt to be irksome. Whatever the reasons may be, the only way in which student responsibility for the basic educational climate of the institution can be developed is by giving students an opportunity to share in that responsibility. The more crowded a campus is, and the more intertwined undergraduate and graduate activities are, the more difficult this of course becomes. Dean Williamson has had some excellent things to say about all this and I commend his wisdom to you.

My observation is made from the vantage point of age, which need not necessarily be cantankerous or rigid. I seem to see emerging a new kind of young faculty member. Whereas in times past one assumed that some kind of distance between an instructor and students was eminently desirable, so that familiarity would not breed its proverbial child, these contemporary scions of the Ph.D. system, when they are genuinely interested in students, have no inhibitions of this kind. They invite young people to their homes for sessions in which cans of beer are mingled with blue jeans -- sessions at which the administration can be genially berated, with a glorious confidence that through this new version of academic freedom the Walt Whitman in us can triumph over the beatnik in us. Or the young professional in the Dean's office will visit the "joints" admission to which is supposed to be innocently surreptitious not in order to see whether any kind of academic decorum is being violated but in order to take off his tie and roll up his sleeves. Thus again relative youth join hands with actual youth in order to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the old order changeth.

We elderly folk on the campus do of course have young people in our homes, but we provide them with napkins and tablecloths, plates and silverware. Our young guests usually come in the clothes they wear when going to church; and though we manage to get good talk going I sometimes feel as if we were living in the good old ante-bellum days-- I am of course referring to the Civil War.

Well, I shall have to resign myself to my fate. It is too late to try the new system. But it will be interesting to see how it works out. Anything which can help to make the necessarily amorphous life of a crowded college or university more personal, warm and human is worth a try. But it too will fail unless we can make of liberal education not what it used to be but what it can become. We cannot prove to be, academically speaking, what we ought to be unless we stage a kind of revolution to find out what can be. I have just read a sheaf of student letters collected at an institution which so far has not been in the news, though it is a large and from the research point of view an enviable one. The point all these letters makes is that their alma

mater is as impersonal as a Greyhound Bus station. Maybe their authors are wrong, but until they stop feeling that way peace on the campus will be a truce only. I am therefore extending an invitation to join the revolution.

What has been said should not be taken to imply that your Commission has labored in vain. Indeed the Report provides for the first time in our academic history a birds-eye view of where we are in so far as very important aspects of academic freedom are concerned. Undoubtedly slumber is no longer a characteristic of American higher education, at least in so far as most administrations are concerned. But in some respects we have been asleep. I am reminded of days past when I was working in the Vincennes Library, just outside of Paris. At lunch I noted that many of my neighbors in the little restaurant were drinking a green aperitif. Upon inquiring I was told that this was a Pernod and very good. That afternoon, with a thick folio open before me, I went sound asleep and did not awaken until the librarian tapped me on the shoulder at closing time. Perhaps some of us have had a secret Pernod formula of their own. Your Report may be a salutary shoulder-tapping device to which some of the brethren may respond.

Freedom is often a very trying dimension of collective existence. Sometimes, indeed, it can be downright ornery. But those of us who have seen a little of life know that not having freedom is about the sorriest plight to which humanity can be subjected. Nevertheless it remains forever true that young people have to find out what living in freedom is. And one can only surmise that the only way they can find out is to try. ...

SPECIAL SESSION
RESTRUCTURING
Monday - April 5, 1965

The special session to consider Restructuring convened at ten-fifteen o'clock, p.m., Vice President Designate A. T. Brugger, Dean of Men, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, presiding.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Gentlemen, this is a meeting of information, elucidation, questioning, whatever you may choose. So without further ado we will throw the floor open for questions about the proposals on restructuring and reorganization. My sole function here is to re-direct such questions as you can throw.

DEAN BURNS CROOKSTON (Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado): How did this wild distribution of representatives of districts get settled on? I just wondered whether the gentlemen who gave the north central district were aware of their geography.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: To answer the question generally, when the executive committee considered the distribution, it came up with many a scheme. Finally it decided to follow the regional accrediting associations.

In the minds of all of us, this is neither equitable nor fair, but in order to minimize the inequitableness or to minimize the unfairness, we thought we would follow these lines which had previously been established.

As to your specific question about the division of the North Central section, I understand that even in the latest report, due to our lateness, there was a minor mistake in the distribution -- any time you talk about two or three states it is not minor, so you will have to forgive me -- there was a mistake in the distribution of the states. Mark, you had the correct line-up. Would you announce them, please?

DEAN MARK SMITH (Denison University): The correct line-up, and it has been this way from the beginning; this is not a change of mind at all. Carl may disagree. I have an idea there is a Freudian error that slipped into this thing all the way. The correct line-up is:

North Central I: Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Wyoming, Arkansas, Missouri, and Western Manitoba.

In other words, Arkansas and Missouri go to the western section of North Central.

North Central II: The east section is Illinois,

Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, eastern Manitoba, and Ontario. Iowa and Minnesota go with the eastern section.

So the split at the river carries Iowa and Minnesota to the east, and Arkansas and Missouri west.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Thank you, Mark. Any other questions?

DEAN HOWARD HOOGESTEGER (Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois): The question about the fairness of the division has another question underlying it that is in my mind. I am guessing offhand that the division of the regions was an attempt to provide broader basic representation within the executive committee. Maybe there were some other things behind it, such as the future development of regional associations. I am not at all sure.

I would like to have someone speak to the reasons behind the development of regional associations, in order to then comment on whether some numerical division, with perhaps more fairness than I see here, is a significant comment or whether it is not.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Do we have a volunteer? May I have one of the members of the committee respond to that?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: If I get you straight, the question is this: What were some of the reasons behind the distribution as you find it here on the paper. Okay?

Number one, principally the executive committee, feeling and understanding something of the growing pains the Association is going through, wanted to provide a ready means -- this is the basis of my answer, a ready means -- for new, young talent to get its voice heard through to the executive committee.

We thought one of the best ways to do this would be to have an elected regional vice president who would be chosen by the people from his own region, and to whom they could go with not only squawks or gripes they may have, but also with projects, research that they were working on. There would be a ready means to bring these new, young ideas and give the young Turk a chance to make himself heard and to cause a little stir in the Association, through his man, and his man would be at every executive committee meeting and would see that this got on the floor.

We divided into regions now, moving up the scale, after kicking it around quite a bit, according to the accrediting agencies. We split North Central because it is so vast.

This is basically the only thing that motivated us. Do you have any further questions on that? If not, thanks.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Any other questions?

DEAN JAMES ORWIG (Berea College, Berea, Kentucky): I am concerned about the status of the small college in this new setup. In the executive committees previously, somehow or another they have managed to get several, at least, one small college man on the executive committee. I am concerned as to how we will have a small college man in this new setup. I mean, it might happen, and it might not.

I think the tendency is for the larger, more popular, better known institutions to get their man in, and the smaller colleges do not, unless they are selected.

Has that been accounted for in any way?

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Yes, it is precisely for that reason that there are four presidential appointees. These appointees have been provided for to equalize any distribution that might, because of a popular vote or because of the distribution of certain districts, tend to favor large schools or state-supported institutions, or any number of categories that you can mention.

Is that a satisfactory answer? This is the rationale for having these presidential appointees. They are the balancers, as it were. Might I just add one other thing, that at the present time there is no guarantee, the way the executive committee is constituted, and the way the elections are taking place, that a small college will be represented. The only thing I can say is this is the rationale behind the presidential appointees.

DEAN PETER H. ARMACOST (Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota): I would like to hear something about the job responsibility of the new regional vice presidents and the modus operandi. As a member of North Central II, if the person who is our vice president comes from West Virginia, say, I would have no contact with him other than at NASPA conventions. So it would be hard for me to see him as my representative any more than I see the executive committee right now as my representative. It seems to me that unless there is some way in which to insure communication on a regional basis, I do not see how this improves the present situation. If in fact it does.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: The whole idea of regional representation was based on this idea of contiguity, for better or worse, whether right or wrong. We simply assumed that a plan within a region, two or three states, any particular plan, would have a certain advisability. The underlying purpose for the regional representation was increased communica-

tion, because the way the present system is set up there is absolutely no guarantee, no mechanism to assure you that any single region will be represented at all. This is the whole rational.

Now this is open to question, it is open to criticism, and if there is a better scheme proposed, certainly we are open to it. Does that answer the question, or does it beg it?

DEAN ARMACOST: Well, in what way would you see the vice presidents working so that there might be better communication within the region than I, at least, see taking place right now? I see the Minnesota dean very, very frequently. I have very little interaction with people in other states that would still be in the same region. How would you see a vice president operating to improve this?

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Dean Knox.

SECRETARY CARL KNOX: There will be an initial balloting. Then there will be a report back on the results of that balloting, because that will result in nominations. Then there will be a final balloting, which would actually designate the regional vice president.

Now, Pete, if you write to your regional vice president, whoever it might be, with an idea, you will get a full response, or an unsatisfactory response, and if you get an unsatisfactory response you vote him out the next year.

We are hopeful of at least developing some ties here, ties that would work both ways, giving members of the committee answering groups, groups that they are responsible to. Although it does not specifically answer your one question, in principle it is hoped on a few years' basis it would certainly answer it. Actually you will notice in the provisions the individual is elected for a one year term, from Conference to Conference. There is nothing there which says that he cannot succeed himself; if he is doing well by the region and the region wishes to continue him, fine. If not, get rid of him and get somebody else.

I grant that you have an unusual circumstance, with Minnesota just not in the central area of the particular region. But if you can come up with a better proposal, certainly the Association would be happy to hear it.

DEAN ARMACOST: At this point, I am not being critical of the vice presidential proposal itself. I feel we might be better off if we could structure the job of vice president more clearly.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: It is a house of representatives.

That is the closest I can come to an analogy.

DEAN FOY (Auburn): Could we have a breakdown by region?

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: I cannot hear you, I am sorry. Would you please come up?

DEAN SMITH: What he wants is a breakdown by numbers of institutions of the regions. Alan Johnson did this.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: We do not have an exact breakdown except for Mr. Johnson. As I said previously, there are a great many problems in terms of a regional distribution. As was explained earlier in the evening, after a great deal of deliberations we thought we would go along with the regional accrediting associations.

If I may elaborate on this, we have a very challenging report from one of the Commissions pointing out that there was a great disparity, and indeed a lack of quality in terms of the accreditation that was being followed for student personnel services, and that increasingly we see some future function of the Association in paralleling the accrediting associations in terms of student personnel services.

As for the exact breakdown, the Northwest has 21 institutions, and 132,000 students.

The Western has 29 institutions and 240,000 students.

The Southern accrediting association has 66 institutions and 377,000 students.

The Middle States, if you will refer back to your plan, in the Middle States association, 84 institutions, 534,000 students.

These will be -- I beg your pardon. This is still one association. New England 25 institutions, 135,000 students. North Central Zone I, 69 institutions, 367,000 students. North Central Zone II, 60 institutions, and 376,000 students.

Does that answer your question, sir? Northwest has 21 institutions and 132,000 students -- 34 inches of rain and a great deal of mineral wealth, which has a great promise in the future. (Laughter)

DEAN ROGER A. WINGETT (Adelphi University, Garden City, New York): Is it the desire of the executive committee that we will have regional meetings?

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: I do not think that the executive committee in this case is really the important thought in this. If a region chooses, for any number of reasons, to get together and have meetings, fine. If a region does not choose to do so, that is also fine.

This was certainly not the intent, to cultivate little sub-groups in this Association.

DEAN JOHN P. GWIN (Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin): I wonder if I might speak to Pete Armacost's question, something as to how regional vice presidents might serve the Association better. I would like to answer the question as to how, etc.

At the present time vice presidents are nominated by the executive committee, and elected by the Association. Here you have two men who are in a sense attempting to serve the total Association. If you have regional vice presidents it would appear to me that they are in a sense going to be concerned with representing their regional association.

In the various areas we do have state associations, regional associations, and what have you. I do not think anybody can predict whether we are going to have regional associations come out of this, or whether we are not. I think it is a possibility. I do not know that it is necessarily a bad possibility.

Regardless of that fact, it seems to me that if you have seven vice presidents, each of which is going to be trying to serve an area, he is going to be identified with the area, trying to meet the needs of the area, trying to get word to the area, to the executive committee, and it just seems to me, in pure mathematical language, there is going to be better representation.

DEAN DON M. DUSHANE (University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon): I would like to ask a question and seek the answer from some member of the executive committee who has been going through this. In the past it was up to the good judgment of the president and the two vice presidents to achieve balance on the executive committee geographically and between types of institutions, liberal arts colleges, small state universities, independent universities, and so forth.

It seems to me that this is as valid a basis for classification -- that is, type of institution -- as is geographical area. It would seem to be conceivable, at least that all seven regions might elect each a state university man, so that there would be no small college representation, or vice versa.

As I look across the range of our problems at my own institution, it seems to me maybe I have more in common

with institutions like mine wherever they are located, rather than those in the same geographic area of a substantially different nature. Do I make clear to you what is bothering me?

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Absolutely.

DEAN DUSHANE: Could I ask for the thinking of the executive committee along these lines? In other words, suppose all seven are the same. What arrangements could the president have to get some kind of balance for the rest of his term?

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Do I see any hands raised on the part of the executive committee?

First as to balance in terms of type of institution, you mentioned that it was the function of the president and the vice presidents to achieve some sort of balance in terms of type of institution. Perhaps the membership from any particular area is equally capable, at least in our thinking, of achieving a balance, (a) either by chance, or (b) simply because the judgment of 541 members may in some instances be as good or better than that of three or four men.

Now, if by sheer chance, and this is quite possible, or if not probable, possible, there may be some type of institution which is represented, a large public institution which may be overwhelmingly represented in terms of the election, remember that the president still has four vice presidential appointees, as earlier pointed out. These were provided for to provide a certain amount of balance.

Additionally, you have four directors, each chosen for his expertise, regardless of his institutional affiliation, in turn advised and directed by five directors, again chosen for expertise.

If you follow this branching out from first, second and third level -- and I do not mean it in any hierarchical sense -- there is ample opportunity to balance. Is that satisfactory, Con?

DEAN MARK SMITH: I think there is one answer, or something that has to be said at this point, that may not answer Don's question, Pete's question, and other questions, but it is true, and it provides an excuse for not being able to answer.

We had, when dealing with structure -- I think, Don, you would understand this better than anybody I know -- to arrive at a judgment as to what was the first order of business with regard to needs for changes in structure. What problems should first of and most essentially be solved? We asked the membership what they perceived to be the essen-

tial problems. Something that ran through the responses to this request so significantly that even I could not avoid it was the feeling of being left out of an "in" group. Remarks about the smoke filled room. Self perpetuation.

The difference between small and large institutions did not appear as the first item of business. It is a problem. For one, I would say that any state university man that gets elected under this system is going to have to have a lot of small school votes. If you ever took a look at Ohio, we have more institutions than California voting.

So we worry about these things, Don, but I think there was need to make the executive committee look like an open group, open to the membership. I will be very honest and add that I was not sold, as a chairman of the ad hoc committee, on this regional election at all. I was persuaded and convinced that the morale factor of openness and direct communication between the membership and the executive committee was the first order of business. So in restructuring we attended to that problem.

We are going to have problems, but the nice thing of it is we have a better structure to work with in solving the problems we have. At least that is my opinion. That is my minority report. (Laughter)

DEAN DANIEL J. SORRELLS (University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia): In this new proposal can it be spelled out this way, that this vice president represents his region; whether he comes from the largest school in that region or from the smallest school in that region doesn't really make a great deal of difference. But he is the voice for that region.

It seems to me by the same token Father Yanitelli represents the whole of NASPA, not his own particular group or his own particular school. By that means you could build in a communication system that ought to work.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: That is so eloquently stated that I do not think it needs an answer, does it, sir? Because this is precisely what the committee had in mind.

DEAN ARMACOST: You have an example of what I have in mind, as suggested by John Gwin's last comment. Suppose we simply said to the vice presidents, we would like to have you whenever possible attend the state meetings, which are already taking place, so that if the vice president, say, is from West Virginia, we would at least expect NASPA to provide the wherewithal for him to come to the Minnesota meeting once in awhile. This is the sort of thing I have in mind that I would like to see built into the program.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Would you like to see this

formalized, is that what you are proposing, Mr. Armacost, that the vice president be bound to attend regional meetings?

DEAN ARMACOST: Not bound to it, but I do think that if we are concerned with communication within the region we ought to specify ways in which this might take place, and encourage the vice presidents to do it, encourage them through the Association, financially.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: I think this is the very reason for the creation of these vice presidencies, and I do not think anyone elected will take this responsibility lightly.

DEAN ARMACOST: My fears are not that they will take it lightly; it is simply that we structure this so that we maximize communications within the regions.

DEAN GWIN: I would like to echo what Mark said, even though I do not agree with him very often. I am a man from a small school. I used to be from a large university, Michigan. I came to this Association, and I cannot remember whether I started coming in 1940, or after I got out of the Navy in 1946. I cannot say honestly that I feel any differently now that I come from Beloit College, where we have 1100 students, than when I came from Michigan where we had 22,000 students. I cannot honestly say that I feel the organization is taking better care of the small college than they are taking care of the large college.

I do not think we should be acting out of fear. I am a little worried about the statement here, where you tie down any representative as being the voice of a region. I think when you elect a man, you elect him to represent the region on the basis of what he gets when he goes to the meeting. I am sure that this is what you meant. I am sure, at least I hope I am sure that any vice president coming from any region, does not come and vote because that region says "you vote this way." This, to me, would be terrible. If this is the way we are going to move, I would be definitely against it.

We have talked about this today, and many, many other times. If you have a representative, let him represent you, but let him represent you honestly, and not in terms of how many voted yes, and how many voted no.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Thank you very much.

DEAN THOMAS A. EMMET (University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan): I was going to agree with John. Pete, I would hope the man would be able to have some good, creative imagination.

DEAN SORRELLS: He would not be there if he didn't.

DEAN EMMET: That is right. He would not be elected. When he thinks in terms of the whole country, of the entire organization, he has to have some give and take.

CHAIRMAN BRUGGER: Any other questions? Then, being within 57 minutes of the witching hour, I would like to thank you all very much.

... The meeting recessed at eleven-three o'clock ...

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION
Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The Fifth General Session convened at nine-twenty o'clock, William H. Knapp, Assistant Director of the Division of Student Personnel Services, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, presiding.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Come to order, please. I would like to say at the outset that if time permits, Mrs. Green will be glad to answer any question which you might have. We will have to limit the time, of course.

It is an honor to introduce Mrs. Edith Green, who represents the Third Oregon Congressional District. Her subject is "Congress and Financial Aid to the College and University Student."

She has sponsored legislation related to other age groups, such as handicapped children and older persons. She has sustained a broad interest in limiting social inequalities in such diverse areas as minimum wage coverage and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Most important for us in NASPA, she has sponsored and guided to passage in the House major assistance programs for colleges and universities.

Mrs. Green is a native of South Dakota, educated in Oregon, where she received a Bachelor's degree in the University of Oregon. She did graduate work at Stanford, and has been awarded three honorary Doctorates. So if you wish to be academic, you may say Dr. Green spoke to us this morning.

She was a public school teacher for fourteen years and served in addition as Public Relations Director of the Oregon Education Association.

In every endeavor she has been the recipient of honors and has been honored as well by being asked to carry out assignments of special significance to her party and to the Nation.

In addition to her many meaningful public contributions, Mrs. Green has in her private life contributed a son, James, to public school teaching in Oregon. Her other son, Richard, is an engineering student. Consequently, it may be a possibility that some of the legislation sponsored by her is based on privileged communication. (Laughter)

A few years ago many of us heard Mrs. Green speak before the Association for Higher Education. At that time the Conference focused on the student. This year we asked Mrs. Green to honor us by being NASPA's Woman of the Year,

and to focus her remarks about Congress and Financial Aid to the College and University Student. Mrs. Green. (Applause)

CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH GREEN (Third District, Oregon; "Congress and Financial Aid to the College and University Student"): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I am very pleased to be here and participate in your 47th Annual Conference.

I have enjoyed the correspondence I have had with Father Yanitelli, Mr. Roberts and Dean Knapp. I have also appreciated the invitations which I have received to attend some of your other sessions, and I wished that it were possible to attend, in fact, all of them. I am sure those of us who stood on the committee would learn a great deal if we were to mingle more often with those who actually do the work on the various campuses.

One of the things I hope my committee will be able to do this year before we act on the legislation is to conduct some field hearings and go into five or six different regions of the country and visit college campuses and hear from you people as to the legislation that is before us.

I am also, Mr. Chairman, particularly pleased to respond to your invitation today because I am advised that for the first time, and at long last, you men have condescended to invite the women deans into your membership, and it seems to me that this very enlightened attitude (laughter) on the part of the academic community is encouraging to the ten women members of Congress and the two of us who serve on the College Education Committee.

So may I say to you new members -- and there are not very many of you here, you are in a small minority -- may I say to you new members, the Women Deans, that when I am on the Hill and hear some of my male colleagues quote that old cliché "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world," and then continue that the women really run this country, I simply think to myself, well, that may be true, but I have never observed it.

Then there is another statement that really needs some clarification. I do not know how many times I have heard that the women of this country own 70 percent of the wealth, and so one day I asked the librarian of Congress to verify this for me. But they report they could find no verification. And neither could the Department of Commerce.

But it does make an interesting statement, and it did especially at the time we were considering the equal pay for equal work bill that was before Congress, and when the plaintiffs in this case, the women, had the audacity to suggest, for example, that there should be equal pay for equal work on the basis of what was fair and just, then, of course, we heard these usual statements.

Now, I know as a woman that most men want women really to lead the sheltered life and to be in the home and absolutely free from any work and anxiety. I think this is all wonderful. However, I do think that a friend of mine who had to be gone from her home an interminably long time, three days, and the husband took care of the home and the four children -- now, there is no question in my mind that the paternal instinct is just as strong as the maternal instinct, but it just gives out sooner. (Laughter) And when my friend arrived after the three days, she was greeted by her husband with a flat statement, "My, I'm glad to see you, but look, if there is ever a divorce, there will be no contest for the children. You can have them." (Laughter)

Seriously, I am glad to be with both the women deans, the men deans and all the people who are in personnel work. And as I said a bit earlier, so much of the legislative life deals vicariously with higher education, by the bills, the testimony of witnesses, that I always welcome this opportunity to participate in a Conference with those from the colleges who help to implement the programs that we in the Congress enact.

I am sure that we do not always anticipate the additional problems created for student personnel administrator, or for college presidents, and indeed, as legislators, I suppose there are times when we complicate life for you, and Congress may be on your campus, as mentioned, in the context of not what it does for you but what it does to you.

On the other hand, perhaps we also during the last few years have passed legislation that will create opportunities for students, and indeed teachers, in your colleges, opportunities that might not otherwise exist.

There is obviously a growing partnership between the Federal government and the colleges and universities. But may I say very emphatically that I want the institutions of higher education to always have and to control more than fifty percent of that partnership stock. And I do get a bit concerned about what may happen, when I hear that the United States government is actually contributing sixty or seventy percent of the operating budgets of certain institutions.

But this morning I want to share with you, as your Chairman suggested, some of the impressions I have sitting in the Congress, and discuss briefly the legislation before us, as a Chairman of the special Subcommittee on Education. And also the responsibilities that I think we share together.

I hesitate to use that word "responsibility." I think it is probably greatly overworked, particularly when it is used in the field of education. The educators speak of the parents' responsibility, and the business people speak of the school's responsibility, and the school speaks

of the Federal government's responsibility, and the Federal government speaks of the state's responsibility, and the state speaks of the local school district's responsibility.

Former President Harry Truman made famous the statement that "the buck stops here." In foreign policy and in many domestic issues this is a valid proposition, but it seems to me in education we are always passing the buck, for the deficiencies in education are always someone else's responsibility and always someone else's problem.

I think it was Luther Burbank who said if we paid no more attention to our plants than we have to our children, we would be living in a world of weeds.

School children in my day and yours memorized many bits of patriotic poetry, and one memorable one ran to the effect:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Heroes and embattled farmers stood
That fired the shot heard 'round the world.

One hundred and ninety-three years later, after Concord and Lexington, there was another shot heard 'round the world, and I refer, of course, to the very successful Russian shot, the Sputnik, in 1957. And it was that historic satellite which forced us here in the United States and in Congress to carry on an agonizing reappraisal of our total educational effort. All of a sudden, Sputnik made clear the competitive position of America. And Sputnik, more than anything else, I believe, forced Congress and this government to re-examine its scientific resources and focus attention on the fierce shortage of personnel in scientific and non-scientific fields.

Then in May, 1954 the Supreme Court struck down enforced racial segregation in the schools, and this compelled community after community, and college after college across our land to take a sometimes reluctant, and a sometimes dismayed and realistic look at the system and its needs.

Then in 1955 another incident occurred. A home-bound Negro domestic with old, tired feet boarded a bus in Montgomery, Alabama, so tired that she decided she would not walk to the back of the bus as the law and the custom decreed, but she sat in a nearby available seat toward the front of the bus. Hers was a sit-down, a symbolic sit-down that was to help to shake and break the segregationist patterns throughout our colleges, universities and schools across the country.

It reminds me of the legal philosopher who tells

us that obedience to the law in a democratic society is a perpetual essay in the conditional mood.

Truly great events do throw long shadows, and these and other events have exposed the fact and fiction in all branches of American education. Parenthetically, I sometimes think that we humans base our observances on the wrong foundations. Wouldn't it be far more worthwhile to observe the anniversaries of occasions that have forced us to reassess and to reappraise and to re-evaluate, than to spend time in self-congratulating verbiage concerning departed items.

A Soviet satellite, a Supreme Court decision, a tired maid -- these helped demonstrate to us that here we were first in wealth, and first in military power, but not necessarily superior in science or technology or in education. And our response nonetheless to the engineering, the scientific and educational challenges implicit in Sputnik has been very strong and fruitful.

The National Defense Education Act of 1956, in which your university students participated, was one result of it. The Academic Facilities Act, to which your Chairman referred a moment ago, through which I hope all of you are building some additional classrooms and libraries and laboratories, these and other bills have passed the Congress in the last eight years.

Yet I cannot forget the testimony of a witness who appeared before our committee. It was the president of the Teachers College at Columbia University. In his testimony he said this: "Education for the modern world cannot be simply a matter of special emphasis at a special time. It must be undertaken and viewed as a comprehensive, complex, broad undertaking." And the full impact of Federal involvement can be properly judged only, it seems to me, when it is seen in relation to the total manpower needs now and in the future.

I have always felt that the mission-oriented type of approach, characteristic of most of our Federal student assistance programs, attempts to satisfy a need in a specific area and for a specific purpose, but in most instances without regard to the total manpower needs.

So we find agency competing against agency to try to attract the most people. And everyone of you are familiar with it on your campus.

National economic growth is dependent on not only a well educated and a skilled work force, but it is also dependent upon a balanced one. And it seems to me that a congressional reaction, response to the educational challenge has been somewhat uncertain at times.

We are in a period that is making great demands upon our democratic system, which of course, as the Selmas, and the Birminghams, and the Oxfords, and the ghettos of the urban areas illustrate, it is not democratic enough.

Democracy, to survive, cannot be a static instrument or government. It should summon from us the best thought and our high purpose and interest. And today at the hearings we are being asked for no less than to broaden our personal goals for our own children, and to make them international goals for all the children of America who are so terribly deprived of full educational opportunity.

On that January day of this year, Lyndon Johnson, in the course of his brief address, said this: "They made a covenant with this land, conceived in justice, written in liberty, bound in union. It was meant one day to inspire the hopes of mankind, for this is what America is about. It is the uncrossed desert, and the unclaimed ridge; it is the star not reached, and the harvest sleeping in the unplowed ground. And indeed there is too much unplowed ground."

This brings me to Alexander Mikeljohn, that very controversial figure in American education, who very recently died, and I never met Mr. Mikeljohn, but I liked him because he once said in an interview, "I am a minority man. I am always wanting change." Let me read, if I may, Mr. Mikeljohn's message of welcome to the Amherst Class of 1919. He said this:

"When a man chooses to go to college, he declares that he wants to be different, that he is not satisfied to be what he is. If any one of you is satisfied with himself, he had better go back and keep still for fear something may happen to disturb his perfection. And if those who stay here are rightly dissatisfied with themselves, then they will satisfy us."

Robert Frost, a contemporary, I thought characterized this particularly well, through verse and debate, as one affected with Mikeljohn. This seems to be the awful and sometimes painful burden which leaders in higher education sometimes have to assume, are the changes that are constantly occurring, the problems that are constantly confronted.

Some students have received an inadequate education in primary or secondary schools, and then gone on to colleges and knock on your doors for admission.

I was particularly disturbed by the testimony of the commissioner this year when he presented the Higher Education Act, and he was talking about the top ten percent of our high school graduates, those who were the best academically. For you women deans, there are some rather startling

figures. Out of the top ten percent of a class, 29 percent of the boys do not go on to college, but 69 percent of the girls in this top ten percent do not go on to college.

This is a loss that this nation cannot afford. We complain, and right now we are hearing a great deal about the junk yards bordering on our highways, and we willingly zone areas of our communities so as to exclude junk yards and dumps and unsightly nuisances. But these youngsters, these dropouts, are in effect junk, in effect tossed about the scrap heap just as surely as the most rigid sorting process in the European and British schools that we ourselves so severely criticize.

The average expenditure of the public school child in this country is \$450.00 a year. According to the President's Manpower Report issued this week there are today 12-million youngsters in the 18 to 21 year college age group, about 800,000 more than last year, and this number will be almost 16-million in 1975. Whether or not this tidal wave starts knocking at your door, indeed we need to ask the question, are we willing to pay taxes for the education of the youth or for the ignorance of the man.

One other college president who appeared before our committee made a statement that I shall also never forget. He said that in a country that spends fifteen times as much on legalized gambling as on higher education, I think we can afford to gamble on every young man and every young woman who is qualified and really wants a college education.

May I say to you that as a member of that committee, I completely and totally reject the philosophy which says that we can afford \$20-billion or \$40-billion on the race to the moon on a crash basis, but we cannot afford to provide adequate educational opportunities on this planet in order to have the scientists and the doctors, and the teachers, and philosophers and the preachers to make life here enriched and meaningful to our people.

I reject the philosophy which says we can spend billions of Federal funds on highways to serve as inter-connecting links between each and every one of our fifty states, but that as a government we cannot afford a boulevard of academic excellence to avoid the educational detours and ruts, a highway of learning over which new ideas and knowledge and democratic ideas and aspirations may travel to every city and town in this country.

I reject the philosophy which says we must spend hundreds of millions of dollars to again break through sound with a still faster supersonic airliner -- otherwise our national prestige will be hurt -- but we cannot afford the money to help break through the walls of prejudice and opposition so that equal educational opportunities will become a

reality for every child, regardless of race, creed, color or sex.

Now, after having said all of this, I want to say also that Congress is constantly under pressure from every quarter to pass all kinds of bills and many times without full debate, without the careful consideration that I think they should have, the consideration of the relation of that particular program that is being considered at that particular moment with the other programs that are already going, and also without consideration of the impact that bill may have on the colleges and universities.

I am sure that most of you have seen the bill that is now before us in the Congress in regard to student assistance. Some of us in the committee are concerned about the proliferation of local programs. Some college administrators who have appeared as witnesses have expressed a wish that the NEDA loans that are now administered under the Office of Education, and the educational loans for nurses that are administered by the Surgeon General, and the educational loans for doctors and dentists and osteopaths that are administered by the Surgeon General, and the Cuban Relief Refugee program administered by still a different government agency, might be combined, and that they might all have the same repayment requirements and the same rate of interest.

I am sure that it would help you to do a better job and it would also facilitate your bookkeeping department and perhaps cut down on administrative costs. But I must say to you also that I do not hold out much hope. I fear that it is going to get worse before it is going to get to the place where somebody down at the Budget Bureau, or in one of the departments, forces some kind of coordinated effort.

Let me confine my remaining remarks now to the particular bill that is before us.

As you know, there are about four different kinds of local programs of student assistance. May I turn first to that part of the program which would provide scholarships. In this particular section of the bill we find that we have \$70-million that is set aside for scholarships for needy students. This will provide approximately 140,000 scholarships.

Some of us on the committee would like your comments. We would welcome letters from you about questions which we are now raising in the committee.

The scholarships are to be from \$200.00 to \$800.00. There must be a needs test. The institution also is required to participate in the NDEA loan program and in the work-study program. Some of you may not be participating in the work-study program at the present time. Under the way the bill

is written you would not be allowed to participate in the scholarship bill that is now before Congress.

Some of us on the committee question the wisdom of this kind of a compulsion or mandatory requirement. And some have written in from various states and have said, "We have a better work-study program in our own institution or at the state level. We have already taken the initiative before the Federal government did it, so why should we be penalized and not allowed to participate in the scholarship program."

There is another requirement, that a student must not have attained the age of 21. Again, we would like your comments as personnel directors. Is this a fair requirement? What about the student who has spent perhaps three years in the military or perhaps has been working and has come back to college and is at the age of 22 but still is a needy student? Should he be barred from securing a scholarship at your college?

Then there is also a requirement which says that preference will be given to those students who are just starting college or who are transferring from another institution. Again some of us have questions about the student who has worked his way through until maybe the Junior year and then he finds himself in real need. Should he not be as eligible for a scholarship grant as the 21 year old who is just starting out?

Let me turn to the second proposition, and this is the guaranteed loan part of it. We have real questions on this particular section of the bill. The AFL-CIO has testified against it, and the bankers have testified against it. That is an unusual occurrence on our committee (laughter) to get the AFL-CIO and the bankers on the same side of any educational issue.

They advise us that eleven states already have guaranteed loan programs; four more have permissive legislation. Then they have given very eloquent statements about the United Student Aid Fund, which I am sure operates on many of your campuses.

One of the witnesses said he thought it would be much better to have an expanded NDEA program, and the term "needy" defined in a more liberal fashion, rather than a guaranteed loan program with a two percent subsidy of interest rates by the Federal government. I just say that I think this probably was offered as an alternative to the Ribicoff proposal for tax deduction, which is not in this particular bill and is not before us at the present time.

So the first two kinds of assistance are the scholarship proposal -- the new kind with the 140,000 scholarships -- and then the guaranteed loan.

The third provision has to do with the extension of the National Defense Education Act. This would be extended for three years, with additional funds available.

I am sure if you have been concerned about student assistance you have been reading the articles about the National Defense Act loans, the delinquencies and the cost. The committee is much concerned about it. Again, we would welcome letters from you as to how you think we could tighten up the language of the bill.

In my judgment there is no part of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 that is more important than the loan provision. We are advised that over 600,000 students have borrowed loans and it has been possible for them to continue their college education because of it. So there is not a person on the committee that wants to jeopardize this loan program, but at the same time Congress must make it unmistakably clear that we expect the loans to be paid back.

There have been alternate suggestions. Let me run through some of them.

One, a Federal agency to administer the collection of the loans. The college would retain the complete autonomy in making the loans in the first place, but perhaps a Federal agency, or perhaps a regional agency would take over the administration of the collection.

The second proposal is that banks would attend to the service of the collection of the loans -- maybe a bank in the college community, or perhaps better, the bank in the home town of the student who made the loan.

Third, a private collection agency. We have letters from these groups who are willing and able.

Then there has also been a question as to whether or not the Social Security loans and information from the Social Security Office should be made available to the colleges if the loan is delinquent, or if the Internal Revenue Service should make the last location of the student who is delinquent on his loan, should that be made available to the college.

The committee is also considering writing a provision into the bill to provide that the borrower has to pay any cost of collection. As you know, that is not a part of the legislation at the present time.

Then there was one interesting letter, just in the last couple of days, from a parent who said that it seemed to him it would be much better to have the parent endorse the loan rather than require the burdensome financial statements and the humiliation of furnishing statements indicating that they are more or less paupers.

I do not know whether you would agree with that. But certainly with the unprecedented growth of our college students, and also with the increased costs in higher education we must not allow the National Defense Education loan act to be destroyed because of the delinquency rates that are receiving so much attention in the press these days and they are much higher than we on the committee imagined. We are told by the office that there is a 16 percent national average, and the rates at some universities are from no delinquency, no collection costs, to as high as 40 percent, and I am told in one university even higher.

The final part of the bill for student assistance is an expansion of the work-study program, allowing \$129-million. I have a little reservation, again, on such a big expansion on this, and again we would like your comments. How many of you are successfully carrying out the work-study program?

I ran into an interesting item the other day that I had not realized. We have a work training program at the high school level and the Department of Labor has set \$1.25 as the minimum wage. But at the college level there is no minimum, and I am told some colleges are paying as low as seventy cents. I turned to my colleague and said, "What is the reason for this?" He said, "It's obvious. The college student isn't worth as much as the high school student." (Laughter)

I suspect that next year there will be a minimum wage also in the work-study program that is now being taken over by the Office of Education, and I suspect that might also be \$1.25.

In summary, it seems to me there is a great deal for all of us to do -- those of you who are in the colleges and universities, those of you who are working directly with the students, and those of us who are in the Congress and trying to look at it on a nation-wide basis.

There is a need for what one poet called a "lovers' quarrel" between the university and society, but neither alienation or complete identification between the two, and new occasions should teach us new duties.

There are new occasions now, and it is upon us to begin the work, though it is obviously not upon us to complete it; for it is less a rocket thrust into outer space, it seems to me, than a national education thrust of massive proportions which may determine who succeeds in mastering the weighty problems of our age.

Alfred North Whitehead said, "The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed; and not all your heroism, and not all your social charm, and not all your wit

and not all your victories on land and sea can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves; tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced upon the uneducated." (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: I am sure that you might agree that if every woman in the world was like Mrs. Green, we would be satisfied to have it be a woman's world. (Laughter)

It is always startling to me -- I cannot speak for NASPA -- this is the way we put such a distance between us in higher education and the problem. I cannot speak for NASPA, I can speak only for myself. I cannot speak for my institution, I can speak only for myself, but it is also rewarding to be reminded where we came from in our student aid programs and where we are going, and that organizations of this sort can do something about the direction. To paraphrase an old cliché, "Behind every successful student aid program there stands a good woman, Mrs. Green." (Laughter)

Keep this in mind. This is the second time I have heard Mrs. Green present material of this sort. It is always different, and yet the fact remains that she does have a real concern about our students, as we do. She is willing to share that elusive responsibility with us.

I think the time has gone, and I think in consideration of Mrs. Green's magnificent effort to speak above her cold, with your approval we will dispense with questions.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

... The Conference recessed at ten o'clock ...

ASSOCIATION BUSINESS MEETING

Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The Business Meeting convened at ten-thirty-five o'clock, President Yanitelli presiding.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: We will call the meeting to order, please.

There is a courtesy to the National Student Association that with the cooperation of NASPA, World University Service and certain other organizations, and the National Institute of Health, is preparing a national conference on student stress and pressures in the college environment. It is an important thing. Different types of institutions are being invited from the central office of the National Institute of Mental Health, and I would ask, if anybody from these institutions is here, to meet at the registration desk immediately after this meeting: Stanford, Tulane, Austin, Randolph, Princeton, Fairleigh Dickinson, Webster College, Morehouse College, New York University, Cornell, Mankato State, Colorado State, Smith, University of Chicago, Lordsburg, Ohio State, Grinnell, University of Vermont, University of California at Riverside, Northern Illinois University, Reed College, Georgetown, Wayne State, Manhattanville, Shippensburg State, University of Toledo, University of California at Berkeley, Washington State University, Harper College, State University of New York at Buffalo, University of Wisconsin, Ball State University, Amherst University.

If anyone here is from those institutions, please meet at the registration desk immediately after this meeting. We will do a little briefing, because your presidents have already received a letter concerning this nation-wide conference.

Now we will get to the agenda immediately. First I will call on Conference Chairman O. D. Roberts.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN O. D. ROBERTS: Thank you. Father Vic, Ladies and Gentlemen: I suspect that announcements are always in order by the Conference Chairman. We try to hold them to a minimum.

The afternoon tour needs to be clarified. That is not just a tour, gentlemen. There is a program planned there. You are going to have the opportunity to hear a great deal about the work of the Department. There is one final change in the location of that meeting. It is listed in the addenda to the program as being in the NASA Auditorium. Instead, it will be in the main auditorium of HEW.

In your program is listed the sites of the future Conferences, and we have them listed through Minneapolis.

I would take this opportunity to inform you that we have now added 1969, Atlanta, Georgia. It will be an April meeting. The approximate date is somewhere around the 12th, I believe it is. I do not have the exact dates with me right now.

You might be interested to know that this year we have registered at the present time, including NASPA members, guests and wives, something in the neighborhood of 864 people, in contrast with our registration last year of 521.

So I hope that there have been follow-ups, and that you will bear with us, and please understand that this was somewhat of a difficult situation attempting to register and handle this many people.

I would like to say, in ending my report, that I am very grateful, over the past three years, for the cooperation the members have given me. They have really been your conferences and your participation, and I think it has indicated the type of work, the type of planning that is productive for NASPA. We like to involve you, if we can. If you have program interests, I suggest you get in touch with Tom Emmet, my successor. We need suggestions from you, and in the past your critiques and your suggestions have been most helpful.

Again, I want to thank you for your cooperation in helping these three years. Thank you. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I hope you have all received a copy of the agenda that was made up by Carl Knox last night somewhere around two o'clock. We will go right along the lines that are written in the agenda.

Bill Brown, are you here? A report on the pre-Conference seminar. I think we owe Bill a debt of gratitude for the way he carried it out. (Applause)

DEAN C. WILLIAM BROWN (Chairman, Pre-Conference Seminar): Thank you. President Vic: I think most of you know that the Third Annual Pre-Conference Seminar was held this year, after the very good beginning at the two previous Conferences carried through by Don Marsh, as an outgrowth of deliberations in Commission III. This has been with the support of the Executive Committee and you as members of NASPA.

There were two changes, I think, that were noteworthy for this year's Conference. One is that it was planned and carried through by a committee, rather than Commission III. The other is that in the program we broke away from complete case studies to include some material which was presented through prepared papers. We did continue to include the processions as they had been utilized in the two previous pre-conference seminar workshop sessions.

We had a total of 75 registrants, 8 cancellations, and two "no shows" so we had a total of 65 who were here, beginning with Friday noon, continuing through luncheon Sunday noon, with the Executive Committee.

The committee working with me in planning the Conference was composed of Carl Anderson of Howard University, and John Gillis of Illinois State. I owe them a very great debt of gratitude for their work, their contribution, their ideas and their stimulation.

In addition, Armour Blackburn from Howard University presented a session on Friday evening on the dollars and cents of administration. This was one of the new areas in the program, and from the comments, I think this was very well received by the participants.

In addition, James Trent, who is research psychologist, at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley, presented a paper on Saturday morning. I think also this was well received by the participants.

Al Cameron, John Gwin and Don Marsh served as case leaders. Don DuShane, John Hocutt, Jesse Peters, Larry Riggs, Father Rivet, Herb Wunderlich and Fred Turner, pinch-hitting for Chuck Peters when he unfortunately had to leave because of the death of his father, served as the old pros.

To all of these I express thanks for their support and help. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you very much.

Last year, as you know, we had operating two vice presidents, one for committees and one for commissions. We will start with John Blackburn, the Vice President of Committees.

VICE PRESIDENT JOHN L. BLACKBURN (Report on Committees): Thank you, Vic.

I really do not know what this discussion was about on academic freedom for students yesterday, because Governor George Wallase has appeared on our campus numerous times. (Laughter)

To report on the committees, actually this year a number of changes have been made, and the old committee-commission structure was not followed exactly, but more the lines of function were followed.

So what was a Committee on Fraternity Relations, became a Commission on Fraternity Relations, headed by Roland Patzer. The Executive Committee charged this group

with responsibility of planning the crucial issues as concern NASPA and its relationship with the fraternity system. This commission turned in an excellent report identifying these issues and the executive committee plans to take them up by task assignments. The executive committee then assigned this group the following task, which was to represent NASPA in its relationship with the formal organizations representing fraternities; and also to study that relationship for appropriate recommendations to the executive committee.

Another committee that became a commission was the Commission on Educational Facilities, headed by John Truitt. They turned in an excellent report.

Reports on Greek housing, residence halls, and administrative student services were received and referred by the executive committee to the Publications Committee, with the hope that a monograph would result which would be mailed out to the members. The committee will now pursue a follow-up and cover student health, library and classroom facilities as well as the Union buildings.

I want to thank the Committee on Membership. This is the regional membership representatives who worked so hard, and from the number of people attending the Conference this year, I think there is some indication of the success this group had.

We had some one-man groups, ad hoc groups that met. Nygreen headed up National Student Organizations and prepared an excellent list of all student organizations. This will be published and mailed to you in the near future.

Bill Blaesser headed up the International Student Programs, and prepared a report. There will be a meeting in May of a number of associations, national agencies and foundations for the purpose of coordinating the concerns and programs of national professional associations with regard to foreign students, focusing the interest and long range plans of such associations on legislation affecting educational exchange and other campus problems regarding foreign students, initiating a study which will help develop a framework for local campus responses for various pressures, thus involving foreign students, and establishing a coordinating framework to permit continuing exchange of program solving information and ideas among the associations. NASPA, through the work of Bill Blaesser, will be exercising the leadership in that group.

We have some Directors that I particularly want to thank: Don Marsh, who became Director of Consulting Services, and turned in an excellent report. The executive committee decided at this time not to pursue a function of consulting services.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you very much.

I will call on Bob Etheridge to report on the Commission work.

VICE PRESIDENT ROBERT F. ETHERIDGE (Report of the Commissions): Father Vic: We disbanded the number system, so if I seem a bit confused, having worked a part of the year with numbers and the rest of the year with titles, I hope you bear with me. All of these are listed in your program, starting on page 28.

The Commission on Professional Relations was headed by Don Winbigler. This Commission had prepared a directory of student personnel organizations in the country and is getting a second volume ready for distribution. As an additional task of this Commission they are working on kinds of regional associations that relate to national organizations and some of their internal operations with a view of trying to better understand NASPA in its proposed reorganization program that is ahead of us.

The Commission on Legal Principles and Problems is headed by John Gwin. Assuming that you are all readers of the Journal, you know that there is a section in the Journal called "The Dean and the Law." Among other things, this Commission is working on the use of student records and privileged communication to review state statutes relating to discriminatory practices and their relation to colleges and universities, the legal implications of policies and procedures followed in an inspection or search of rooms or residences.

There are two parts on liability factors, (1) insurance coverage on student trips, and (2) liability factors in those areas of mental health problems, such as notification of parents, and this sort of thing, a study of the liability of chaperones and advisers of organizations, libelous material in publications, and the illegal use of narcotics. I refer you to the program this afternoon in which we are fortunate to have members from the national government to explore this rather difficult problem with us.

The Commission on Inservice Education, headed by Richard Gross, has prepared an elaborate paper on the whole problem of inservices, and hopes to follow it with a theoretical or philosophical portion, up to an appendix, or "how to do it" item, which hopefully will be available to the membership at the earliest possible moment.

Bill Brown has already spoken all that needs to be spoken, and your applause indicates how you felt about his work as Pre-Conference Seminar Director. I need not elaborate further on that.

The whole area of professional preparation is certainly something that needs consideration, and it has been my privilege, along with Dean Venderbush, to serve as your representative to the COSPA Commission on Professional Development.

Just before the Conference was placed in order, Nelson Parkhurst, the Chairman of the COSPA organization, brought before us the first results of a proposal for preparation in college student personnel work. That has appeared in the AACRAO Journal. I hope it will soon appear in the NASPA Journal to give you some guidelines for consideration of the problems of professional development.

In progress also is a career brochure in which we are trying to update the pioneer work that NASPA entered into. Dean Venderbush is the editor of that project. We hope to have that available for distribution to NASPA and the other COSPA organizations within -- he is smiling -- we will say for your summer reading.

The Committee on Evaluation Procedures was headed up by Harry L. McCloskey, and I publicly apologize to Harry for not having had his name in the program as Chairman of that Committee. They went to work this year and prepared for us a document in which they have attempted to summarize the various criteria that they use for evaluation procedures by the various accrediting agencies. They would hope to combine these to a point of bringing up-to-date those items that are used in the evaluation of student personnel organizations.

The Commission on Student Financial Aids is headed by Bill Knapp. Certainly you saw evidence of the work of that Commission by the presentation this morning of Congresswoman Green. Bill continues to be very active with this Commission and it goes without saying that with all sorts of federal legislation and interest in this area they are going to be extremely busy in the future.

The Executive Committee gave them an elaborate charge to consider. They are in the process now of telling us that which is possible. They are also becoming more concerned with the foreign student and his aid considerations, aid considerations for the junior college program, and in general trying to counteract the mis-information about financial aid matters, such as have appeared this year in the Wall Street Journal and various other national media. I might add that Lyle Reynolds, the Dean of Students from the University of California, Santa Barbara, was inadvertently omitted from this Commission's listing.

We had a study group this year headed up by Phil Price, in trying to work out some relationships with the Sterns Study group. They did present an excellent and provocative report to the Executive Committee, but at this time

the Executive Committee felt that it would be best not to continue with the group in an active role, but ask Phil if he would serve in a continuing liaison capacity with that study group and keep us informed. Phil has very graciously consented to do this.

The last Commission -- when you build an entire Conference, in essence, around a Commission such as we did with the Study Commission on Student and Social Issues, headed up by Ed Williamson, and ably assisted by John Cowan, when the whole Conference kind of pivots on something like that, I do not think anything that can be said about a Commission such as that will be anything but anticlimactic.

I want to say that I certainly have enjoyed working with the Commission Chairmen and all the Commission members this year, and I look forward to many pleasant hours in the future.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: One of the men working behind the scenes, doing enormous work there, the Secretary-Treasurer Carl Knox. (Applause)

SECRETARY-TREASURER CARL W. KNOX (Report of Secretary-Treasurer): I have ten points to make. I intend to stress all except seven of them. (Laughter)

One, our fiscal balance was about \$9,500.00 just prior to this Conference. It should carry us through the remainder of the fiscal year.

Two, our membership is at an all-time high. Three factors seem to contribute to this, or will account for it: (1) the success of the NASPA Journal with its obvious visibility; (2) the policy of individual affiliation, which has the potential of making our Association more meaningful to more individuals, and (3) with this I again refer to the unsung efforts of Vice President Blackburn and his 48 regional membership representatives out in the "boondocks." Current figures show that we have 451 voting delegates, 143 institutional delegates, 34 associates, and 35 student affiliates. This totals 451 institutional members and 663 individual affiliations.

In conclusion, could I ask you to keep us posted so that the roster may be kept as accurate as possible. On the rosters which you received was a particular blank. If we had any errors in spelling, in titles, please give us the word on that sheet.

There will be an official audit by a CPA firm circulated again this summer as it was last.

Proceedings of this Conference -- and incidentally there have been questions about our seminars where Mr. Gans

was not directly on hand. All of these were taped, and we will be including them in the Proceedings. Proceedings will be sent to all Conference registrants. So be certain that your receipt for registration was signed by Mrs. Drake or a representative from the Conference table.

Now one last note: At the Registration Desk, we will be happy and delighted to cash any checks as long as our cash holds out. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Dick Hulet, the Placement Officer.

DEAN RICHARD E. HULET (Placement Officer): It seems to be a problem to have all your money tied up in cash. (Laughter)

I would like to report that your Placement Service during this Conference has done a brisk business in the Woodley Room. Those of you who were there during the morning and afternoon when it was open yesterday know how brisk it was.

We were operating under certain handicaps. But I think we have managed to get some people together that wished to get together.

I would like to report that prior to the opening of this Conference we had 148 candidates for positions listed, and 57 openings. Since the Conference began and since the Placement Service opened on Sunday, we listed 125 additional candidates and 104 openings. This gives us a total of 273 candidates and 161 openings, which leaves 112 people without a job, (Laughter) seemingly.

However, there are actually additional listings which we do not have and there has been considerable talk between people looking for positions and people looking for placement of our people in their schools, so I am sure we will not end up with 112 people out of work.

I would like to acknowledge with grateful appreciation the work of my secretary, Mrs. Dorothy Spruck, who has been present at the Placement Service at all times, and since I have not been, she really deserves the thanks from the Association for doing all the work.

We have been handicapped by, I believe, two things, one minor, and that was the room was a little small. It could not be helped.

The other rather amazed me. That is that we are operating a placement service which was designed to meet the needs of our Association prior to the growth which had been mentioned so many times, and to which Carl Knox alluded just

a minute ago. We will have to redesign the work of the Placement Service. I enlist your assistance in this. You may be hearing from me. The Executive Committee has directed me to study how we may still be of service to the individual members and to member institutions of the Association and still not get into a "flesh market" approach to this business of placement.

If we can accomplish this -- and it will be a neat trick if we can do it -- we will have to have your help. So with the Executive Committee's direction and with the assistance which you, I hope, will give to us, we will try our best to work out some kind of compromise situation to try to be of real service and yet not simply turn the Conference over to a series of discussions about whether or not someone can get a job or whether someone has a good job available.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you, Dick.

Now the editor of our Journal, Dick Siggelkow.

DEAN RICHARD A. SIGGELKOW (Editor): It is a little hard to describe the job of the Editor. It's a little like my wife who never drinks but the other day she took a sip of whiskey and said that it tasted terrible, and I said, "Yes, and all these years you thought I was enjoying it." (Laughter) I just wish we had half the fun here our wives think we do.

There are two basic purposes of the Journal, one, with the obvious, educational and professional tool we think it represents, it is designed to promote NASPA as an organization; but the one I want to discuss very briefly with you is the encouragement of writing from the membership. We will get at you one way or another through contributions to a point of view, or contributions to "Spotlight on Innovation" or something like this. But the procedure and the way the board works, hopefully with contributions from the membership, is what I want to tell you about.

It goes to three members without your name on it. They in turn react to it very, very critically. It comes back, a little proofreading work is done on it, and it goes back to you with "accepted," "rejected," or "accepted with change."

The Journal will be as good as the members will make it. If we are going to encourage our own membership to write, I want you to feel free to submit your article, whether it is accepted, rejected, or accepted with change.

Fred Smith also asked me to tell you that we are not trying to be restrictive with the term "Spotlight on Innovation." We may change the title and say something like

"Spotlight on Projects that Work Here." We realize there are very few new things in the world. We simply want to know what is going on in your school and what works there. So do not be afraid of the title "Spotlight on Innovation." We can never get enough good articles.

I would like to ask you one other thing. We have not been aggressive about the Journal. I have been aggressive. I find people avoiding me here like the plague, because every time I see them I try to get an article. We have not been aggressively publicizing the Journal. We have enough copies to supply libraries. But we have not done this because the first two issues, as you know, were published in an off-size. We are now reprinting the first two, so they will be the same size as the present Journals are.

When you go back to your home base, would you at least comment to your librarians, or show them a copy of the Journal, and ask them, or have them send a subscription in to our treasurer so we can begin to move gradually into the library market. If you do not do this, some day we will run out of copies and it will not be available for that purpose.

I want to thank the assistant editors, the coordinators and the board for the work they have done, and to conclude by reading from No. 2, Volume II, a very brief paragraph that I think describes where we are trying to go. We are at the side of the hill, not the top. Watch the darn thing, it may fly yet. We are developing new themes of interest and from a questionnaire of over a year and a half ago that we sent to about a third of the membership, we began to develop the Journal. The paragraph is:

"Your reactions, suggestions and contributions are much appreciated. The membership must feel free to contribute to its own publication in any appropriate manner. We ultimately hope to achieve a fine balance that encourages our own members to write, supplemented by unique contributions by outsiders and occasional statements by outstanding authors who are recognized outstanding leaders in the field."

We appreciate your continued support. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: There is just the one thing: there are no more reports. There is just one thing I want to say.

There are a number of people on the Executive Committee who worked very hard, and as outgoing president, it would be unfair for me not to say "thank you" to not only them, but to all you people who have been working on the Committees and Commissions.

We went through some very hard hours in getting things together, and we thought of ourselves as being you,

the membership, when not in session, in order to try to keep an orientation of this being your Association doing your business for you.

Glen Nygreen has been called to the Office of Education. He is not here. I want to thank "Ad" Brugger of California and Dave Robinson of Emory. I want to thank Tom Emmet who is going to take over the Conference Chairmanship from O. D., Fred Turner, Jim McLeod, Earl Clifford, Alan Johnson, Robert Ross (whose boss told me he better stay home because he had business for him), Mark Smith, and Kenny Venderbush.

I can only say to you, the membership, that never once at any time that we met was anything that you proposed, or said or did, left in abeyance or not given full, objective (as far as we were capable of doing it) and considered discussion.

Now let us go to the reorganization proposals. You all have a copy of them, I hope. This is the addendum to the program that was distributed yesterday for discussion last night. There are two pages. With your permission, and open to your suggestion, my idea was to read the two pages, while you followed along, then go back, proposal by proposal. Any objection to this, or do you think it is a waste of time? The intention here is to make sure that you do not vote unless all your questions are answered. I do not care how you vote, but it is important that you vote with a satisfied mind.

PROPOSALS FOR NASPA REORGANIZATION

Proposed: I. That there be established an Association Office under the direction of a full-time Administrative Assistant with limited responsibilities in the areas of records, correspondence, office expenditures, and convention mechanics.
(No constitutional change)

The Administrative Assistant would receive a salary in the \$6,000-7,200 range and would work directly for the President of the Association while serving various officers.

Proposed: II. That Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Article IV be revised as follows:

Section 1
(Changes Article IV Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Constitution)

The officers of the Association shall be a President, a President Designate, seven regionally elected Vice Presidents and a Conference Chairman charged with the duties usually ascribed to such officers.

Section 2. The President, the President Designate, and the seven Vice Presidents shall serve from the time of the annual meeting until the

the installation of new officers at the next annual meeting.

Section 3

That seven Vice Presidents of the Association shall be nominated and elected by mailed vote on a regional basis by the voting delegates in each of the six regional accrediting areas, two vice presidents being elected from the North Central area.

Section 3 becomes former Section 4 which is eliminated.

Proposed: III. That the affairs of the Association be divided into four areas:

1. Professional Relations and Legislation
2. Professional Development and Standards
3. Research and Publications
4. Association Personnel and Services

No
Constitutional
Change

That each of these divisions be headed by a Director appointed by the Executive Committee for a two year term.

That an Advisory Committee of five members be appointed (by the Executive Committee for three year terms) for each of the four Directors.

Replaces: Committees, Commissions and Representatives

Proposed: IV. That Article IV Section 6 be changed to read:

(Changes
Article IV
Section 6)

There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of: The President, the President Designate, the seven regionally elected Vice Presidents, the four Directors of Association Affairs, four members appointed by the President to one year terms, the Journal Editor and the Conference Chairman, ex officio.

The Executive Committee elects its own secretary to keep the membership informed of matters of interest throughout the year.

Proposed: V. That there be a Placement Director, Controller, Historian and Pre-Conference Seminar Chairman, reporting directly to the Executive Committee.

(No Constitutional
Change)

* * * * *

Proposal I means that we are thinking of a central office, but we are not thinking of an executive secretary such as AHE, NEA, and so on have. We are thinking of a capable administrative person who will handle a whole lot of the business of the Association and act really as an active, full-time, on-going administrative assistant to the President and to the Executive Committee to get the work done. The advantage of this will be that you will have a central place for your inquiries, the work for the agendas of the Executive Committee will be accumulated, everything will be more in order, and we feel we will get more efficiency for you out of that.

Proposal II -- I just want to tell you that Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Article IV are referring to memberships and so on.

The meaning of Section 1 (Proposed II) is that the Executive Committee is looking for more widespread representation of your voice in the active work of the Executive Committee. The intention that was behind it was to give young men with new ideas a point of reference to which they could bring those ideas, projects for research, and so on, and an easy funnell, because the regionally elected Vice President will have to be at every Executive Committee meeting, in so far as is physically possible.

Section 2 (Proposed II), here we split the North Central simply because it was so vast that we thought it would be easier to manage. What the meaning of this is, it is conceived that these regional Vice Presidents will be elected, and it will be by you, the people in the institutions, in the specific areas of the country.

Proposal III -- what this means is that all the on-going business of the Association is conceived as fitting under the categories of Professional Relations and Legislation, Professional Development and Standards, Research and Publications, and Association Personnel and Services, and I think that last one -- no. I was going to say I think the last one includes relationships with other associations, but that seems to be under number 1, am I correct?

DEAN HULET: Yes.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Now, we want expertise here, and instead of having just the president appoint these people we are having the Executive Committee entirely come through the membership list for expertise. Get the people that seem to be identified, and with their advice, help them to appoint five consultants, because we had so many committees and so many commissions, there is work that is still on-going that will not cease. We want no interruption in the on-going progress of the Association. It is with these people, these consultants that a director will make up what he is going to

report and what he will bring to the Executive Committee at the three, four, or five Executive Committee meetings that take place each year. This replaces, of course, the structure of committees, commissions and representatives.

Proposal IV -- what this means is that the President should have an option to pick people with whom he works, with whom he knows he can work easily, since so much is elected. This is a part of the procedure that has been in NASPA for years, and we feel that it is not anything except an arm to work with him, for him to lean on, to work with if he feels he needs it. At the same time, everything else is pretty much elected by the membership or by the Executive Committee as a whole. The Journal Editor, the Conference Chairman, ex officio, also form parts of that.

What we need is a kind of an ad hoc secretary from out of the Executive Committee to keep the membership informed, to do the things, with this in mind, that when the administrative assistant through the central office are established, we will make the transfer of documents, records, and responsibilities from our own Secretary-Treasurer just that much easier.

Proposal V -- what this means is that these men here are not voting members of the Executive Committee but they are very closely allied to it and therefore report to it.

Following that are two Executive Committee Resolutions re Implementation:

I

That the Executive Committee implement the restructuring plan, including regional mail nominations and elections of the Vice Presidents by the June 1966 Conference.

What we have here is simply the resolution that we are proposing to you after we go through the restructuring process that will enable the Executive Committee to begin tonight to plan how the regional Vice Presidents are going to be elected by you in the region.

II

- a. That the four directors be appointed promptly.
- b. The incoming President and the present Executive Committee will agree on the appointment of the four members-at-large.
- c. The present five Executive Committee members-at-large and the two Vice Presidents shall serve as members of the next Executive Committee until the seven regional Vice Presidents have been elected. (By June 1)

What that means simply is to keep the fellows who are now in office working along with the Executive Committee until such time as these regional Vice Presidents are elected. It is just a question of continuing the business and not having gaps.

d. The present Secretary-Treasurer will continue to serve until the Association Office is established and the Administrative Assistant is appointed.

That is simply an enabling clause to keep us going on. The Special Note -- you can see that.

Now to go back, Proposal I, involving no constitutional change:

"That there be established an Association Office under the direction of a full-time Administrative Assistant with limited responsibilities in the areas of records, correspondence, office expenditures, and convention mechanics."

Are there any questions?

DEAN WM. R. BUTLER (Ohio University, Athens): One question and one comment. Does this suggest an increase in dues to the Association?

The comment is, I suspect that we are interested in continuity of having those persons serve over a period of several years in order to provide the kind of service that is necessary, and I wonder if you have not fixed the salary at too low a level to get this sort of qualified person. It probably ought to be up to \$10,000 in order to get the kind of person to stay with the Association for a period of time.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: In answer to your first question, we had Jim McLeod's committee study the expense item on this thing, and at this moment it seems as if dues will not be touched. This is our best judgment at this moment. Does anyone disagree with this who was in on the discussion? No, we do not contemplate at this moment that this will cause a rise in dues because we studied it, we really did.

Your comment about the salary range, we beat this over the head for quite a time. We thought, too, and letters came in -- for which I wish to thank you one and all, those of you who wrote in your comments -- letters came in indicating that this is too low, that you are getting an inept person or an inadequate person. Well, we have in mind a kind of managerial career gal, perhaps, or one who has been happily married and is at peace with the world, but who is efficient. (Laughter) What we are thinking of is getting work out. We are not thinking of a true executive that stands on his or her own. I do not mean to in any way go counter to Congresswoman Edith Green's equal pay for equal

work. The man who gets this would be within that range. Then if we cannot find the properly qualified person to do the functions we outline for him, at that salary, we will have to come back at another salary range, that is all.

I would like a motion to accept that paragraph, please, anybody?

DEAN WILLIAM L. SWARTZBAUGH (Amherst College, Amherst): I move to adopt Proposal I.

DEAN DONALD K. ANDERSON (University of Washington, Seattle): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Now the question. There is a question here.

DEAN BURNS B. CROOKSTON (Colorado State University, Fort Collins): Has the committee considered the location of this office, and if so, where would it be?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The question is, has the committee considered the location of the office, and if so, where would it be.

The committee is at this moment considering the location of this office. We have not come to any determination on where it would be. The general feeling is that it should be in the middle west, because of the difference in rentals and that sort of thing. Our experience here in Washington -- we do not necessarily at this moment want to ask for a Washington office and all that sort of thing, and we have a group going out getting prices and figuring out the type and quantity of office space needed, and getting prices on the possible rentals, airconditioning and all that sort of thing.

DEAN GWIN (Beloit College): I recognize that the administrative assistant would work directly with the president and I assume with the Executive Committee. Is it necessary, or would it be wise to put him on as an ex officio member of the Executive Committee, or is the working relationship close enough without doing that?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: We discussed that, Jack. The question is would this administrative assistant, being so far from the Association's affairs, would it be appropriate to put this person as a member of the Executive Committee. In our discussion on that, we concluded no, the person would be totally involved in every operation of the Executive Committee but only in order to do its work.

Did someone call for the question?

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: All those in favor of adopting Proposal I with no constitutional change, please indicate by saying aye; all those opposed. So carried.

Proposal II -- this is a constitutional change in Article IV, Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4.

"Section 1. The officers of the Association shall be a President, a President Designate, seven regionally elected Vice Presidents and a Conference Chairman charged with the duties usually ascribed to such officers."

Do you want to take that section first?

DEAN CROOKSTON (Colorado State): I so move.

DEAN LAWRENCE A. RIGGS (DePauw University): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The motion has been made and seconded. The floor is open for discussion. Is anyone opposed to the motion? Any question on it? Anyone for it? Very good. I will then ask for a vote.

All those in favor of accepting Section 1 of this proposal please indicate by saying aye; all those opposed. It is so carried.

"Section 2. The President, the President Designate, and the seven Vice Presidents shall serve from the time of the annual meeting until the installation of new officers at the next annual meeting."

We simply worded that this way because there is an occasional variation on a June meeting or an April meeting or something like that, and the meaning of this is simply to go from annual conference to annual conference, no matter when it happens, so that sometimes an Executive Committee may go fourteen months, you know, such as this one will. It will go from April until next June. May I have a motion to accept this?

DEAN WM. R. BUTLER (Ohio University): I so move.

DEAN S. W. HIGGINBOTHAM (Rice University, Houston): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Any discussion?

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The question has been called. All in favor of approving Section 2 please indicate by saying aye; opposed. So carried.

"Section 3. That seven Vice Presidents of the Association shall be nominated and elected by mailed vote on a regional basis by the voting delegates in each of the six regional accrediting areas, two vice presidents being elected from the North Central area."

Let me explain that procedure. A ballot will go out to all people in a certain area asking you to put in nomination that person, or those persons that you feel will best represent you in that region. When the nominations are received, they will be cataloged, and together with the report to you on how they were cataloged, they will be sent back to you to be voted upon. Am I correct, Carl?

SECRETARY KNOX: Yes. And with the ballot will be a listing of all affiliates in that particular region.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Oh yes. With the ballot will be listed all the affiliates, so keep your Proceedings and your membership list. Every once in awhile you may want to go down and review a name or two.

Are there any questions about this? May I have a motion to accept?

DEAN PETER H. ARMACOST (Augsburg College): I move the adoption of Section 3.

DEAN HOWARD W. CONNORS (University of South Dakota, Vermillion): I would like to second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Any discussion on this?

DEAN TURNER: President Vic, will there be an opportunity for write-ins on the final ballot by region?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: There will be an opportunity for write-ins on the ballot for the final election.

DEAN GEORGE T. MAZUSAN (University of Vermont): I am an institutional delegate without a voting power. From Mr. Knox's statistics there are roughly 141 of us. This is roughly one third of the organization that does not have voting power. As the organization grows, I am sure that this percentage will go up.

Are there any proposals, or is there a committee that is investigating this aspect of the constitution so that members like myself and the rest of the institutional delegates without voting power will get this voting power in the future? We are at the grassroots level, yet we do not have a real voice nor a power behind the voice in this organization.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Very good, George.

The question as proposed is this, that there are, and will continue to be obviously from all the signs, a growing number of institutional delegates, associates and affiliates who do not have the power to vote here in this body because the voting delegate is the real one from the institution and because NASPA since its inception has had its membership listed by institution.

So your question is a very pertinent question. Tom Emmet, you had something you wanted to reply to that?

DEAN EMMET: I would like to answer this question. You mean on the floor here, or do you mean in the election process? You have a vote in the election, and you can be elected. Is that clear to you?

DEAN MAZUSAN: The proposal states that the Vice Presidents, Regional Vice Presidents, will be elected by the voting delegates.

DEAN EMMET: Does it say by the voting delegates? This is what it says?

DEAN MAZUSAN: Yes.

DEAN EMMET: But you could be elected, however.

DEAN MAZUSAN: Yes, but I could not vote.

DEAN EMMET: Historically the Association has tried to always have institutional representation primarily for facts that come up like this: Supposing someone came to the floor and wanted to pass a motion concerning, let us say, federal legislation, which an institution would have to take a stand on. I am sure most of you know I represent a Catholic institution, or I used to. My Vice President does now. If we did not choose to agree with the position that the floor took, it would be rather silly for me to vote in conflict with what our president back home believes.

Therefore there is some real need for an institutional representative and a method of having an institutional vote. It would be foolish, I think, for us to pass federal legislation or anything else that might be in conflict with our first obligation as representatives of an institution, and that is the historic method of this.

That, very frankly, I think distinguishes it from a number of other associations that I have some contact with where I often go to meetings and find a large number of people -- three or four from certain institutions -- if they happen to be nearby and at the meeting, passing all kinds of motions and things for me that at my institution I am not in agreement with personally and I know my institution is not.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you, Tom. This is a real anomaly. You can be elected, but you cannot vote in your own election. Is that understood? At least that is the way it stands and reads here.

DEAN CHARLES H. WILDY (University of Southern Florida, Tampa): You have said Section 3 on this part. Did you say it becomes Section 4? Is this actually Section 4? You are holding Section 3 on the constitution, on the Conference Chairman?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The whole of Section 3 becomes --

DEAN DuSHANE: When these three before you now have passed, if all three are passed, then present Section 3 becomes Section 4 automatically.

DEAN JACK MATTHEWS (University of Missouri, Columbia): Do I understand this man may be elected to the Executive Committee, have a vote there, yet not have a vote in an important issue on the convention floor? This is the way it is to be?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: That is the way it reads here, Jack. I am not defending it or anything. I am simply stating what is here.

DEAN VENDERBUSH: That is the way it is now.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Right, that is the way it is now.

DEAN DONALD M. SUTTON (Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia): Would it be possible, sir, to re-word this slightly so that in concern for the man from Vermont, and the gentleman next to me from another Virginia college and myself -- would it be possible for the delegates to vote at the regional level, and the institution vote at the national level?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The proposal that has just been made asks the question whether it would be possible for all members, that is to say the voting delegates to the institutional delegates, the associates and the student affiliates, would it be possible for them all to vote on the regional level, and only for the voting delegate to vote on the national level?

DEAN DuSHANE: I speak now not as your parliamentarian, but as a voting delegate. It seems to me this is highly understandable, and it does violence to what the Executive Committee had in mind when this entire section was proposed. We have votes, one for institutions, big, middle, small. One. Just one. If we grant a vote also to these

additional categories we will be giving multiple votes to big institutions, and in this particular part of the proposal the major objective was to get away from the idea of dominance by a small group of old guard and to broaden the base of representation.

It seems to me that the heart of the proposal is one vote per institution to broaden, rather than to give multiple votes to those with additional delegates.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Call for the question. All those in favor of accepting this Section 3, with its changes in the constitution, please indicate by saying aye; all those opposed. So carried.

Proposal III, no constitutional changes required.

DEAN TURNER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise the question with the Parliamentarian, do we need to take action to change this number?

DEAN DUSHANE: I would say that without objection the President can say that when you voted a new 3 the old 3 automatically becomes 4.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Is there any objection to my doing that? Before this august body, I now say that Section 3 becomes former Section 4, which is eliminated.

Proposal III. "That the affairs of the Association be divided into four areas:

1. Profession Relations and Legislation
2. Professional Development and Standards
3. Research and Publications
4. Association Personnel and Services

That each of these divisions be headed by a Director appointed by the Executive Committee for a two year term.

That an Advisory Committee of five members be appointed (by the Executive Committee for three year terms) for each of the four Directors."

I would like to have a motion.

DEAN JOHN E. HOCUTT (University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware): I move the adoption of this proposal.

DEAN DANIEL J. SORRELLS (University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: It has been moved and seconded

that it be established. The floor is open for discussion on that.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I see a hand.

DEAN JAMES P. ORWIG (Berea College, Berea, Kentucky): There is a little note on top of page 2 that says "Replaces Committees, Commissions and Representatives." Does that mean all of those are no longer in existence, or did I misunderstand it?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you for asking the question. It means the structure as you have it in the program does not exist, but the work they are doing and the personnel go on, until we can get this straight. The work will continue. This is why we are voting on it, so we can pass the work into simply a new structure. Nothing will stop the work.

DEAN ORWIG: Then all of it will be under these four major committees?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: That is right. For instance, the thing we are doing on professional development, the Dean and the Law, and whatever comes out of Dean McCloskey's study, and so forth, is fitted into slots that come under these four major headings.

The question has been called. I will call for the vote. All those in favor of this motion please indicate by saying aye; those opposed. It is so passed.

Proposal IV. "That Article IV Section 6 be changed to read:

"There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of: The President, the President Designate, the seven regionally elected Vice Presidents, the four Directors of Association Affairs, four members appointed by the President to one year terms, the Journal Editor and the Conference Chairman, ex officio.

"The Executive Committee elects its own secretary to keep the membership informed of matters of interest throughout the year."

I would like to have a motion for acceptance.

DEAN WILLIAM F. GRIFFITH (Colgate University, Hamilton, New York): I move the adoption.

DEAN WARREN H. SHIRLEY (Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida): I second the motion.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The motion has been made and seconded to accept this proposal IV. Is there any discussion?

DEAN ROBERT B. MORRIS (State University of New York, Albany): According to the proposal there would be eleven members on the Executive Committee for one year, and nine members for two or more years. Would you give us the thinking of the Executive Committee for providing for continuity in this body?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Very good. The nine members that will continue over will be members who will be task oriented. They will be on it because they have a specifically outlined job to do. For instance, Commission VIII, the report we had here began in 1961, believe it or not, to get the things moving, and it would have been disastrous two years ago to have dropped Williamson from it, or something like that. This is our general idea, that in this area, where there is carry-over, it is simply because of the task orientation of these people.

DEAN KENNETH R. VENDERBUSH (Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin): I think the question is more of how is continuity to be provided when only nine are continued. I think the answer the Executive Committee had in mind was that granted nine seems to be a minority of nineteen, but that there is a possibility that these one year regionally elected Vice Presidents might succeed themselves, and probably if they are doing a good job they will, so there is a possibility for more continuity and some outgoing officers might be re-elected, regional Vice Presidents as well.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The regionally elected Vice President could be re-elected, yes.

DEAN ROBERT C. MILDGRAM (University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee): Are the duties of the Secretary-Treasurer now taken over by the administrative assistant? Is this implied?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Yes.

DEAN MILDGRAM: Which means there would be no Secretary-Treasurer?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: That is right. There would also be a controller to supervise the financial affairs. We already began with a public accountant's auditing of our books for the membership. We feel that having a controller constantly will help even more.

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: All those in favor of the adoption of Proposal IV as it stands please indicate by saying aye; opposed. It is carried.

Proposal V. "That there be a Placement Director, Controller, Historian and Pre-Conference Seminar Chairman, reporting directly to the Executive Committee."

The thinking here was that these men are doing work that is so closely allied to what this Association does and stands for that they be very tightly joined in with the Executive Committee even though, in working this out, we thought they should not be given voting power on these matters.

May I have a motion to accept this?

DEAN JORGEN S. THOMPSON (Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota): I move we accept it.

DEAN ARMACOST (Augsburg College, Minneapolis): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: It has been moved and seconded to accept the Proposal. Discussion?

DEAN HOWARD W. CONNORS (University of South Dakota, Vermillion): How do they get to be, by appointment?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: By appointment to the Executive Committee.

DEAN CONNORS: Does it say that some place? Are you covered?

DEAN TURNER: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion by adding the words "appointed by" immediately after the words "Seminar Chairman." It will then read: "... Pre-Conference Seminar Chairman, appointed by and reporting directly to the Executive Committee."

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Did everyone get that recommended amendment? It reads as follows: "That there be a Placement Director, Controller, Historian and Pre-Conference Seminar Chairman, appointed by" -- three words -- "appointed by and reporting directly to the Executive Committee."

... Cries of "Second" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Will the original maker of the motion accept the amendment?

DEAN THOMPSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Any discussion? The original maker of the motion has accepted the amendment as read. We are now discussing it.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The question has been called. All those in favor of accepting Propoxal V as amended, and there is no constitutional change, please indicate by saying aye; opposed. So carried.

DEAN DuSHANE: President Vic, before you go to implementation, I misled you, and I would like to rectify that error. Having now eliminated the Secretary-Treasurer from the named officers, and having eliminated him from the Executive Committee, it is still necessary for us to eliminate him from the constitution. This is a reference which was intended on page 1, where it says "former Section 4 eliminated."

I move that former Section 4, which now reads: "The Secretary-Treasurer shall serve from the time of election at the annual meeting until the election of a new officer at the third following annual meeting," be eliminated.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Any second to that motion?

DEAN HAROLD D. MURPHY (East Texas State College, Commerce, Texas): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: It has been moved and seconded that Section 4 of the constitution, regarding the Secretary-Treasurer, be eliminated.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: All those in favor of the motion please indicate by saying aye; all those opposed. Carried.

Two Executive Committee resolutions re implementation. Resolution I. "That the Executive Committee implement the restructuring plan, including regional mail nominations and elections of the Vice Presidents by the June 1966 Conference."

We are putting that Conference as the target, simply that we put a target date for the fulfillment and the carry-over of the whole business. It does not mean that the Executive Committee tonight cannot get to work and get the business done. Actually we have a target date already of June 1, as you will see later in the next one.

May I have a motion to accept this?

DEAN JAMES R. DAVIES (Northland College, Ashland, Wisconsin): I move that the two resolutions be accepted. I do not think there is any real point in discussing them further. They are necessary to what we have already done.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The motion has been made to adopt both resolutions. He does not see the purpose of going on.

DEAN HAROLD M. BITNER (University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii): I second the motion. He doesn't see any need to go over what we have already done.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The motion is made and seconded to accept both resolutions.

... Cries of "Question" ...

DEAN CHARLES H. WILDY (University of Southern Florida): Under "a" of resolution II the four directors would be appointed promptly. Is there any provision you would stay there, or have two appointed for a one year term and two appointed for a two year term, and continue with the continuity on the Executive Committee?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Yes, indeed. I just want to call on the President Designate, but he has given me a very sage nod. No problem.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The question is called. All those in favor of accepting both resolutions re implementation please indicate by saying aye; all those opposed. It is carried.

At this time, then, I want to thank you gentlemen for the work you put into this. I mean you people for reading it and coming last night, and all that sort of thing. It was very gratefully appreciated.

I would like to call on John Hocutt, Senior Past President attending this Conference to give a report of the Committee on Nominations.

PAST PRESIDENT JOHN E. HOCUTT (Report of Committee on Nominations): On page 21 of your program, the Committee on Nominations is described as follows: "Made up of all Past Presidents in attendance, plus six members elected by the Association. The senior Past President present serves as the Chairman."

Your Nominating Committee met this last Sunday evening, following the dinner and the program at Howard University. In attendance were:

Dean Dushane, Dean Turner, Dean Clevenger, Dean McLeod, and Hocutt, representing six former Presidents in attendance at this Conference. Also attending was the current President Victor Yanitelli.

The Association elected six members of this Committee and five of the six were present at this meeting: Dean Blackburn of Alabama, Dean Crafts of Pittsburgh, Dean Gwin of Beloit, Dean Riggs of DePauw, and Dean Simes of Penn State.

It is my privilege and pleasure to place in nomination on behalf of this Committee, Dean Ed Williamson of the University of Minnesota, as President Designate.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you very much. The Committee on Nominations has placed on the ballot the name of Ed Williamson for President Designate. Is there a second?

DEAN GWIN (Beloit): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Now are there any further nominations from the floor? This is a practice, and a policy and a procedure that we have always followed, to keep nominations always open for the membership to state.

Is there any discussion on the nomination of Dean Williamson? I would just like to say that it comes at the perfect time, of course, with the study.

... Cries of "Question" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The question has been called. All those in favor of Dean Williamson as President Designate for NASPA please indicate by saying aye; all those opposed. It is so carried. (Applause)

I would like to report that Ed Williamson is at a TV studio cutting a tape. They have been harassing him like crazy; he would have been here otherwise.

... Announcement re NSA ...

DEAN SHELTON L. BEATTY (Pomona College, Claremont, California): I should like to recommend to the planners of the pre-seminar for all newcomers, in view of the very large size of this organization now, that we increase the amount of attention given to having something like a sponsor system or something similar, to aid newcomers here in getting a wider acquaintance from the very first day of their arrival.

I think we run the risk of becoming a megalith ourselves if we do not pay attention to the lack of identification among us, and aid newcomers. I am now old enough that I dare say such things, but I have not lost my memory, and I do remember when it was extremely hard as a youngster in this organization to know anybody, and I am not satisfied, as an oldtimer, however young I am, that one should assume that just because he has been told what it is like to be at a convention and has been inducted into some of the mysteries of being a Dean of Students, that he therefore is really

in the Seventh Heaven among all of the angels as soon as God's pastures are opened, I mean, as soon as the convention is in full session.

Therefore I should like to recommend that even more attention be given than is already given to this excellent seminar. I praise it highly for one of the most constructive things we have done.

I would like to recommend that we do much more to make it possible for human beings to come here, to be given humanitarian treatment as a member of the organization, and that means a sponsor -- more than one, maybe -- who helps make sure a newcomer gets around, and I do not mean just gets another job, I mean gets around and is known. (Applause)

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I would like to comment just to say that we began a little bit on that, toward having a luncheon with the Executive Committee trying to get to know them a little more; that steps are constantly being taken, and I would just recommend now, before I get pitched out of office, to Bill Brown that he study ways and means of making this possible through the pre-conference seminar and the Executive Committee.

DEAN MARK SMITH: I just wanted to say that if this goes into committee and gets lost, you pay my liquor bills next year, as a substitute motion.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Be glad to. (Laughter)

DEAN ROBERT H. SHAFFER (Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana): I think we passed over something. I would like to move -- and it has nothing to do with the Association this year, the mechanics of it -- a vote of commendation and thanks to the officers and members of the board who did an awful lot of detail work with ingenuity and resourcefulness, that one who has done this in the past knows it takes; I think this body owes a vote of thanks to these men who do this. Whether it works or not is something else, but the leaders did a job, and I certainly move that the sense of this be thanks to our President and his officers. (Applause)

... Cries of "Second" and applause ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I am deeply moved. Thank you.

Is there any further business before the Association? Well, with a heartfelt sigh of both relief and regret this meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

... The Conference recessed at twelve o'clock ...

SEMINAR
"College Unions"
Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The seminar convened in the Baltimore Room, Dean John W. Truitt, Dean of Students, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana, presiding.

DEAN EDWARD MALLOY (Dean, State University of New York, Stony Brook, Long Island, New York): The one who introduced me was afraid on Sunday that he was going to have to deliver the speech because I was not here, but I am afraid I will have to do the introductions. I know some of you are anxious to get on and make sure you are able to make the trip this afternoon.

Actually I think I display the height of guts in coming here today. I am the substitute. The real experts are on the west coast. The Association of College Unions is having its meeting at exactly the same time, so all the people active in the field are there, and I was asked to fill in. Actually, I am the Director of Admissions of the State University of New York at Stony Brook, which floors some people when they hear the title "Student Unions," but my real love is student unions and until two and a half years ago I was a Union Director and in college activities.

So I must apologize if some of these people are not here. I know that the President himself, of the Association of College Unions would like to be here.

What I would like to do -- and thank goodness Dr. Kauffman did it yesterday (I thought I was lost) -- but this was described as a seminar to me, so I thought I would make a few remarks, and then we would get into some questions and bat it around, and you can be a lot like the two cannibals who were having dinner, and the one cannibal said to the other, "I just can't stand your mother-in-law." And the other one said, "That's all right, just concentrate on the vegetables." (Laughter)

So if you want to concentrate on the vegetables with me, we can do that. But I do have a few prepared remarks that I would like to go into on this.

Logan Wilson, the President of the American Council on Education -- but before I do that, I should just make sure that what we are talking about here is college Unions, because we were at a conference in Miami, and this nice old lady got into the elevator and she saw our signs which just said ACU. It did not spell out Association of College Unions. So she peered and said, "What's that?" I said, "That's the Association of College Unions." She said, "My goodness, are they organizing them now too?" So I hope we are organized, but in a different sense.

But to get back to Logan Wilson, the President of the American Council on Education, he said:

"Today's college student is in danger of becoming the forgotten man of higher education, a faceless anonymity, with his IBM cards, student numbers, programmed instruction, and many other ways of handling large numbers.

"We need to re-examine our extracurricular life along with the other phases, and it may well be that certain preoccupations of the 19th century college life are no longer fitting. Colleges and universities cannot be indifferent to questions of student honesty, integrity and morality. I believe that every college or university has a responsibility for what happens to a student outside the classroom. And this is especially true for the residential college. That obligation cannot be sidestepped, no matter how much we may wish to avoid it. Qualities of character, conscience, and citizenship are part of the educational development of our students. All of us, faculty as well as students, make a tragic mistake if we proclaim that this is not the proper business of the college."

To which I am sure those representatives of the denominational schools would say a hearty "amen," and the only exception that I would take is, why leave out the commuting colleges? It would seem especially important that they have these values reinforced, although we can well see whether it is the place of the parent or not that we do take in the residential colleges.

Actually, just to make sure, I am sure we cover a wide variety of schools, some with long history of an active Union, some perhaps contemplating it, some that I should give a brief resume of the Union movement.

You know, this is an honorable term, "Union". Certainly it is in this hotel, at this period anyway. But it is not always a term that is accepted in some parts of the country. But the term goes back to the old Oxford and Cambridge debating unions. So this is a term that was borrowed quite literally, and we hear about the Harvard Union and others in the late 19th century in this country.

But actually the first building that we know of with an American collegiate institution was Town Hall at the University of Pennsylvania, in 1895. And this was basically like a gentlemen's club. They always spoke of men; they never included ladies in these purposes, and all the things that you think of with a gentlemen's club to provide discussion and leisure activities for gentlemen was what they wanted to do.

Then up to about World War II there were about 100 unions throughout the country, so that there was some activity, but the real big push on Unions came after World

War II. The great growth came then. Actually they have been growing very fast. The Association of College Unions, back in 1949 reported about 150 members and then about 150 buildings being planned. Now they have over 500 members and about 200 buildings being planned.

Boris Bell, in a survey last year showed that there was nearly a 200 percent growth in Unions from 1951 to 1953, and 40 percent of them had been built since 1957. This, of course, is all possible because of federal money, as well as a growing realization of the college of the purpose of the Union.

It was about 1958, I think -- I am hazy on the dates -- when the Union was included in the HHFA loans, along with residence halls. It had not been up to that time.

Along with these perhaps 600 buildings, there are many places where the term "Union" is used, whether it is an improvization of a building, or a converted structure of some sort. In fact, the way that it is likely to be told is that if you start something along the Union lines you generally can prove that there is a need for a larger, and larger demand.

Actually, the thing that worries me is that when we think of Union we will think of a building, and this is fine, but a Union building is only part of the total Union. When we think of Union, we must think of an organization and a program as well as a building. The building can be quite an edifice, but it is useless if it has not been used. And there have been schools where the Union building has been a complete flop. There have been various reasons that it was just not used.

The program, to me, is far more important than the architecture or the physical facilities, although we certainly do not want to bypass any of these features.

You know, in this group here, I am sure there are many problems. I was chuckling. I have gone back and reviewed the minutes and the bulletins of the Association of College Unions to find out what the trends were. Back in the late forties we were still talking about a return to normalcy. We just kept thinking this was an attainable goal. "When these veterans of World War II get out then we'll have normalcy again."

Then we were concerned about married students in increasing numbers, and sit-ins, and concerns about the rights of students in the investigation agencies. Then we were concerned about the warnings of the great population wave, and now we are actually dealing with this. Then we have this nice, current phase of student demonstrations. It is nice to know, though, that students have not changed too much. There

are still demonstrations about food and things like that, as well as the idea of tenure for popular professors, and practically any other cause.

The increasing college population and potential college population, and the need to accommodate larger numbers, present problems of direct concerns to the students and the office of the Dean of Students. I guess we all assume that anything that affects the students affects the Dean of Students. We must realize that we have many varying campuses, and this is one of the valuable things, I think, that I have learned through my association with Union work, that you look at your own campus, you try to assess your own campus, you borrow the good ideas from other schools if you think they fit, but you do not necessarily transplant them, because what works on one campus may not work on another. But there are all sorts of things.

Chester Barry of Stanford listed three types of Unions that he sees:

1. The service station. This is just a collection of facilities and services, from check cashing to barber shop, to just about any service you may want, including bowling, or billiards, or anything else.

2. The second he lists is a friendly community center, where all portions of the community are represented, where the faculty wives may be meeting, where the alumni congregate, where various groups may be around.

3. The third, much like the second, a friendly place and a community center but where the students are actively involved in both policy making and programming. Of course, this is the one where he would lean very strongly.

And Barry, a Union Director, by the way, questions very strongly why some colleges build Unions, because the revenue producing activity seems to be the dominant feature, and often a paying event will push out a non-paying student event. This may sound horrifying, but these are some of the facts of life.

Now my contention is that the student Union -- and actually I made a mistake when I used the term "student Union," because the trend is away from "student Union." They want to use the term College Union these days, to show that we are using all phases of the community. By that we mean students, certainly, we mean faculty, administrators, too, and alumni. So all phases are used, and it is a true community center and a true blending of the different facets of the community.

Actually I am sorry I came out without a clipping. I think you would have been amused. I guess some of you saw

the Bill of Rights of the students who met at the University of Pennsylvania last week. A good many representatives from the W. DuBois Club, but they wanted administrators to be just caretakers and custodians, and then last night's Washington Evening Star had an editorial coming back in rebuttal at this group.

Actually with the term College Unions, we still are assuming that the students are going to be the main factors in this. They are there four year. The alumni and others who are coming back will be of a smaller number. The students will be the whole body of it. But they will be there with the guidance and leadership of a professional staff.

Back in 1962 Don Mallett of Purdue and NASPA fame spoke to Union directors, and he listed some of the hopes of the administration for a Union program. One was to be an integral part as well as to complement the educational program of the University. Two, to provide leadership in the areas of student activity and student social life. I would like you to see the word "leadership" there. Three, on the majority of campuses to serve as the front door to the University from the standpoint of parents, visitors, conferences. Four, to serve the faculty and staff of the University in the unique way in which any University family demands. I am sure that all of us will have different demands from our different University families.

Don also said that because of the changing patterns that have come in there are more students, changing curricula, greater pressure on the students as a result of the explosion of knowledge, and as well as the simple increases that grow out of the increasing complexities of our society, that the breaking of time honored traditions will be the rule rather than the exception, so that we have to be prepared for change. Don felt that the Union can fit in as the situation varies with the setting of the college, the type, the environment, whatever it might be, and of course, I am sure the friendliness or lack of it from the top university administration.

I am still, in effect, paraphrasing Don. He felt that in his talks with some leading administrators, they felt that the formal curricula did not allow enough time to discuss many aspects of our changing culture. And we can see this all the time.

The technical schools are increasingly concerned, the engineering schools, with their phases. This was used as an example, that perhaps at the engineering schools they could have a program such as Purdue, where they call it "Books and Coffee," I think, where the faculty are invited to discuss some current books over coffee, and the students may gather. This is quite a change for the engineering student, especially, who is in the midst of many technical courses.

Also, as a counterpart to that, we might think of the small liberal arts school which has some limited facilities is not necessarily concerned a great deal with the engineering phases. The idea of discussing the uses of the computer might fit in as a complement to the program.

This especially strikes home to me, when I think how our history department is now advising all history majors to take a course in the computer for the recall of knowledge and to be familiar with this and the possibilities that we can have.

One phase that might cause a lot of people to raise their eyebrows, Don talked about the social graces, and the fact that this is something that we should be taking part in, in the college situation. Now this, I know, so many people will oppose; yet many people are for. I guess it depends on the sophistication of the college population. But at the University of Illinois, for one, Irene Pearson, their Director, at many times put out booklets and cues, and there were ways of bringing the students up on their social graces, coming from varying backgrounds, and many from homes where they were to lead the way in the university life.

Actually, the policies and the environment of the Union will go far toward determining the dress and the general environmental level of the university campus. I hope this can be shown in many ways.

There are many ways where students in the Union have set the regulations for determining the dress, whether it be in the Union or attending special events sponsored by the Union.

Along with this and the total educational pattern, Boroff, in a talk that he gave, said that you never see the intellectuals attacking the Wisconsin Union, and the reason is that the intellectual life has been brought into the life of the Union. And this is a most active program, one that is constantly bringing in all phases of the university, the art program, literature, poetry, whatever it may be, so that this is just a natural phase of the educational program.

Also Don felt that under this second point of providing leadership in the areas of student activities, that we could afford opportunities for development of leadership, group experience, and perhaps actual interest development.

I think that is self explanatory, but with these days of increasing numbers, again, giving any one individual the right or the opportunity to come forward and develop themselves in a group is a good experience. We have heard a great deal about under-achievers, and over-conformists, and non-conformists, and all of these probably can find a right in the Union.

Actually, the one place that Don did put forth a fairly strong point in criticism, I feel, was in the area of the social life. He felt that less creative thinking and fewer new ideas have come forward in the area of the social life and the program than any other phase of the Union program.

As far as the front door goes, I think we all know how much an attitude of visitors can be set by the receptionist or the secretary of the Union. I like to recall being at one Union which was the height of hospitality and friendliness, I thought, except that we ate in the cafeteria and everybody was very nice serving, except one person at the end. The cashier was just a real grouch, and this person undid the good work of everyone. All the good work was undone, and I am sure you have seen it many times. You do 900 good things, and a thousand good things, and the one bad thing sets it off. But I guess that is what we have with life.

Actually, I hope we will discuss your areas of concern. As I read back and tried to stand off a little bit, I felt that I could see several patterns emerging in the literature of the college Union people, and I act from that side at this time.

One is the concern of the increasing numbers. First, how do they accommodate them? Building additions, finances, all of these things are going on. The whole history of college Unions has been that even if you do not increase the population too much, the idea of the use of the building expands so that you normally will find a need to expand the building. But with this need of taking just a larger population, it is a real concern just how fast they can build, and how they can build moneywise. The government is there but it has to be paid off one way or another.

Two, or perhaps part of one -- I cannot quite break it off -- is the change in the types of activities, what to do? We all know that some things are no longer popular. It seems that except in Utah big dances do not seem to draw any more. They seem to be a real bomb on the college campus. But Utah and our Mormon friends, they keep dancing away, and I guess at the University of Utah the ballroom is about an acre square, so they really make allowance for it.

But how do you plan for these things, and how do you anticipate? Do you build in a room for demonstrations so they can sit-in all day with their own private entrance, or what do you do about it?

Then another phase is how do you play a part of this entire educational setup? There are some Union directors I know who are most interested in being a part of the entire educational setup, but, frankly, get very little

cooperation from some of the academic departments. Just how can they stimulate along these lines?

The very obvious ones, of course, are fine arts, and music, where you display the fine arts there, build it right in the lobby or show case, or whatever it may be, and the music playing there. Some schools that I have been connected with have played reviews of the humanities course music, you know, over the PA, just so the students can at least recognize it. He may remember the name when he is on the test; if not, at least he has heard it before.

Then with this educational setup there are problems -- not enough staff in many places. You would be amazed at the number of big units that have less than six professionals. This may sound a lot to some people, but the idea of one professional person in the Union is not at all unusual. He operates alone, so he would have to be a jack of all trades.

Duane Lake gave a talk. He called it "Operation Cross-purposes," and he described the many hats that the student Union director had to wear, whether it be program adviser, or business manager, or disciplinarian -- all of these different phases in which he took part. But this is no news to those Deans of Students who probably are doing this many times.

One thing that I do not see quite as much of now, but I still detect it, is how to make a compatible setup with the student government and the Union government. This is especially true with a school bringing in a new union where there is a going student government. If it is not done correctly, there seems to be a great deal of hostility generated. It seems almost universal that the Union government wants to be separate from the student government. It seems almost universal that the student government wants to retain control of it. And they have been settled in varying fashions. I hope it is on the decrease. I feel very strongly that there is a need for both groups, and that the experience where there has been only one board has been very poor. It just does not work out. Generally the details take too much of the time, and the planning does not get the time that it deserves.

A very important phase, I think, is where does the Union fit into the student personnel program? This is a hard one to answer. I have detected some resentment among the Deans, that it looks like the Union people are going out on their own, that they are making parallel tracks, rather than being part of the student personnel program.

One dean resented the fact that the statement of purpose of the Association of College Unions had sounded so much like the purpose of this organization. I think that is

great, if they want to go along parallel tracks, at least in philosophy. But I think something has to be done that we are not duplicating. There is an awful lot of work to be done without duplicating in some phase.

Actually, Lyons, on his Doctoral thesis, made a study and found that the director of the Union was increasingly becoming a part of the student personnel setup under the Dean of Students.

On the other hand, Boris Bell made a study last year and felt that only 36 percent of the Union directors, of new Unions since '57 in existence, were under the Dean of Students.

So this is a tough situation. In many of the small campus situations you will find that there is a dual role, which to me seems to be the happy medium. The director of the Union is also the director of student activities. This took place in about 52 percent of the Unions surveyed by Bell. But again, it is because there was a heavy proportion of smaller schools represented, under 5,000 students.

Last, probably I may be touching off some points here, the professional position of the staff member -- this goes right in with five, but I thought I should emphasize it. I like to tell the story of an oldtimer in student Union work who said that when he started he reported directly to the President, and now he had nine people between the President and himself. Well, we all know that bureaucracy is increasing, but the question is just where it is to go.

I feel that I should like to study -- actually, at the same time, I borrowed a study, a study I made, and this was the Big 10 and the Big 7. Am I saying it right? Is it the Big 7? These were reports sent to eighteen schools and fourteen replied, I believe. But just to show you the variety of the setup: 3 directors of Unions reported to the president and the governing board, the governing board being composed of a great many varieties, whether it is alumni, faculty, administration, students. One reports to the Provost. One to the vice president -- no, one reports to three people, the Provost, the Vice President for Business and the Dean of Students and the governing board. Two report to the Vice President for Business and Finance. One to the President and a Business Manager. Two to a Vice President for Student Affairs. One to a Vice President for Business and Executive Dean of Students. One to a Business Manager and Dean of Students. Two to the Director of Auxiliary Services. And one to Dean of Students.

So you can see that there is a complicated setup, and you just cannot possibly expect to take another campus situation.

Also, I think that the Union Director, who generally is a fairly capable gentleman and involved with many things, has felt that in his stress in recent years on the educational aspect of the union, and identifying himself with the student personnel phase has been current in the Association of College Unions. He has alienated the Vice President of Business Affairs. He has refused to do some things. He has let the food service handle particular food problems rather than controlling it within the Union.

Yet on a big campus he may have to compete with the campus activity director operating out of the Student Affairs Office. So I think that rightly so there is some confusion. I do not know what it is -- what is the ecclesiastical phrase, primus inter pares, or something like that, first among equals, perhaps for the Dean of Students, but I think we have to do something to make sure that this student personnel program is going through.

I guess all talks should end with a couple of quotes, and just to give you hope let me give a quote. Actually, this is Warden of Heart House -- the Warden of Heart House is the phrase for the Union Director up at the University of Toronto. He actually was a prison warden though, but that had no influence in getting him his job nor his title. But he is quite a philosopher about Union work. A year ago he gave this talk, and he said:

"A university does not exist solely in the classroom, the library or the laboratory. True education is a many splendored thing. It is a gem of many facets. It is not merely a service station or a comfortable lounge."

Then he went on and said, "Somehow or another it is concerned with the pursuit of wisdom, with the appreciation of all those things which man in his highest moments recognizes as excellent."

Dr. James Nickerson, the Vice President for Academic Affairs at North Dakota State, said that "the growing situation that the Union is becoming a central agency which seeks to afford the range of activities needed to establish one's sense of belonging, an opportunity to live with leisure, a means to sustain the dialog among students, and among the several component groups which make up the modern university."

Well, I have talked long enough. Thank you very much for your attention. (Applause)

Shall we have some questions, as a true seminar should.

... Discussion ensued ...

SEMINAR
"Speaker Policies and Practices"
Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The seminar convened in the Annapolis Room at one-thirty o'clock, Dean Edwin M. Gaines, Dean of Men, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GAINES: Gentlemen, when I speak to a group of student personnel workers I cannot resist telling a favorite story I heard. It is particularly fitting for Deans of Men. It concerns a student who was walking across our campus one night, late, and he heard a little voice down by his foot saying, "Pick me up. Pick me up." He looked down there, and there was a little green toad. This little green toad said, "Pick me up and take me home." So the student reached down, picked up the toad, proceeded across campus late at night, went up to his dormitory, walked upstairs, took the toad into his room, closed the door, and no sooner had he set the toad on the bed than it turned into a big, beautiful woman.

"And that's my story, Dean, and I'm going to stick with it." (Laughter)

I would like to introduce our speaker, and I am certainly privileged to do so.

He spent two years at the University of Michigan, where he was a member of Delta Kappa Epsilon. In 1937 he entered the seminary at Milford, Ohio. He taught at Loyola of Chicago from 1944 to 1947. He was ordained a Catholic priest in 1950, and he went to Xavier University as Dean of men for one year in 1952. He has been there ever since.

He served on the committee of NASPA that drew up a Code of Ethics for NASPA members. I suppose it was needed a great deal. He was the chairman of the Conference of Jesuit Student Personnel Administrators, which is the Jesuit equivalent to NASPA, and made up of the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities.

It is my privilege to introduce Father Ratterman.

REV. PATRICK H. RATTERMAN, S.J. (Dean of Men, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio): Thank you, Ed.

You know, you have no idea of how close we came to not having this session. Ed called me up at one o'clock, up in my room. Fortunately I was out of bed, and he said that he had forgotten the papers that he had to introduce me. So I gave it to him over the phone. He left out one thing, incidentally. The Delta Kappa Epsilon, as you probably know, is known as the Drunken Dekes, and I thought for years I was the only Drunken Deke who was a Catholic priest, until I was explaining this one time out in Denver, at Regis College, to

Father Ryan, who is the President of Regis College, and I said, "I guess I'm the only Drunken Deke that is alive or in captivity." He said, "No, there are two. I'm one too, so there are two of us." (Laughter)

After I got through giving him this introductory material over the phone, I said, "I'll see you at two o'clock." Fortunately he caught it and he called back with a complete double take, and he said, "Say, did you know that thing is at one-thirty?"

Then I came down the elevator and I pushed the double button. I figured I would get myself into the lower level. I ended up in the corridors over there with the washing machines and everything else, and I had to get back up, but anyway here we are.

What we will do this afternoon is, in a sense, unstructured. There are a number of possibilities. I will explain to you briefly some of the findings of the study -- John Cowan was going to be here. He probably thinks the meeting is going to be at two o'clock too. He will probably be able to give you more details of what came out of it -- that is, a more detailed analysis of this study in regard to speakers.

So what I figured we would do is this: We would start out, and I have mimeographed some sheets here. I think they have been passed out. I can give you a brief resume of what we tried to do in the study, and give you an indication of some of the results, how they came out. Then we can entertain questions. I will do the best I can to handle your questions.

You must realize that I was only on the committee that worked on this thing, and it was run off on these machines up at the University of Minnesota. The material that is over here is what the committee members received. There are 24 chapters. There is the general report, the first draft. And the general report, the second draft, which is the one that you received. I have brought all of that material down because I thought you might like the opportunity to come up and look over this or that chapter to see how the study was done, so it is just available to you.

I am not trying to floor you with a bunch of material. I am not going to use it at all possibly, but it is there, and I thought you might like to see it.

After we go through this, and I explain what I have on these three sheets that I am passing out to you, we can go off on a number of ways.

I personally have some reservations about certain things that the study seems to indicate. We can talk about that, if you want, which more or less has to do with the

philosophy behind academic freedom for students. You might like to discuss speaker policies on your various campuses. You might like to discuss experiences that you have had with respect to speakers. So there are any number of things that we can do after we go through the initial material, which will not take very long.

Now I presume that each of you has this, and I think it will help us a great deal. I wrote this out before I left Cincinnati, and had it duplicated here, and I think it will speed things up, rather than my trying to just explain it to you without your having any material in your hands.

There are five separate groups of respondents, as you know, on each campus, and these respondents were the presidents, then the deans of men, the dean of any faculty committee that had to do with student life, then the student body president, and the student news editors. If you want to put these figures in there -- I did not have them at the time I sent this down to be mimeographed.

There were 757 presidents who sent in replies; 813 deans of men. They proved to be the most responsible people on campus. Student affairs chairmen 800; student body presidents, 807; student news editors 785. So anybody can see that the presidents are the least responsible people on the campus

We had complete sets of questionnaires. We got all five respondents to reply from 695 schools. So 695 is the total over-all sampling, but then we got additional questionnaires from this or that member of various schools, and that is why all the rest of the numbers are higher.

Now in this particular study I hope you realize there were four or five distinct studies that were made. For instance, we sent our first, and asked the responses -- the first questions had to do with 14 controversial topics. We asked: "Suppose these 14 controversial topics came up on your campus, would you allow them to be discussed openly?" and so on.

Then we outlined 9 controversial situations, and asked some questions about those. Then we took up this business of controversial campus speakers. Then of each group we tried to get some sort of a statement or philosophy. Particularly, they are from the deans of men and from the presidents of the institutions. So the study itself was broken down and we are talking about just this one particular part of it, which had to do with the controversial off-campus speakers.

Now, instead of just asking for bland statements from people we selected, the committee selected 17 speakers.

They were picked because in the mind of the commission, each one was identified with some controversial social issue, and to take them together they seemed to cover the broad spectrum of what you might call extremely liberal or extremely radical sides -- they seemed to spread themselves across, which was natural enough. Now we picked those ahead of time.

The question that was asked in regard to these controversial speakers is as follows:

"On some campuses some of the following individuals have been characterized as controversial. Which, if any, have spoken or would be permitted to speak on your campus? Which, if any, might be considered so controversial that you think the administration would strongly object to the question of the advisability of their appearance?"

Notice -- and I will point this out down below, that we asked the respondents not to give their personal opinion, whether they thought the speaker should be allowed on the campus. We were not interested in this. We wanted the newspaper and the student council president, and everybody else to tell us what did they think the administration would do if this invitation were extended by the students.

What were the possible answers? There was a place to check that "this speaker has spoken on our campus." Or, secondly, "This speaker could speak on our campus, but he has not spoken." Third, they could say they "just don't know." Fourth, "advisability questioned."

In other words, if that were checked, that meant that this student council president, or this business editor thought that the administration would question the advisability of this speaker speaking on campus.

Now we found out something in the replies that came back. We found out that this thing meant two different things to different people, and perhaps the questionnaire might be criticized on this score. You will notice the question was never asked "could not speak." We gave them no opportunity to say that this speaker would be barred on our campus. That was done intentionally. We spent a great bit of time in getting up these questionnaires trying to figure out, how can we get people to be honest. We do not want to put them into a situation where they will just be forced, almost, or feel a strong compulsion to not give an embarrassing answer. So we did not ask the question, "Would he be barred on your campus?" We felt they might or might not want to check that. So we will let that one go.

But when it came out that the advisability question could be interpreted in two ways, this appeared because some people made two checks. Some people checked, "Yes, he could speak on our campus," and they also checked "advisability questioned."

He could talk, but we are not so darned proud of it, and we don't know whether we like it or not.

Obviously, to other people the "advisability questioned," meant that he is not going to be allowed in here.

I notice you have all been peeking back on the third page, which is perfectly all right, but if you will notice, we have the speakers divided into three categories. Is it the second or the third page? It is the third page. You will notice that the speakers are categorized. Some of them are called -- this came out differently when they duplicated it from my original, so I am speaking now about the third page, Roman numeral VII. You will notice of the 17 speakers, 5 of them are called acceptable, 8 of them are called controversial, and 4 of them are called highly controversial.

This is an arbitrary distinction which was made by the analyst after he was making this study, because instead of just putting them all down in a line and giving statistics after each one, it was quite obvious that the top 4 or 5, is it, that they were acceptable to a vast majority of campuses. Either they had spoken or they could speak, and so the cut off line was arbitrarily established there of 70 percent. The top five speakers either had spoken or could speak on 70 percent of the campuses.

Then we grouped the rest of them into controversial and highly controversial.

If you go down to the highly controversial, they had spoken or could speak on less than one-third of the campuses in the United States. Then you have the middle group which we labeled controversial.

VOICE: I notice here that the figures are given on the acceptable and the controversial, but not on the highly controversial on our form.

DEAN RATTERMAN: Well, that is because I ended up typing this last Friday night at eleven-thirty, and I had worked from five o'clock in the afternoon right through, and I was hungry and tired, and I forgot to put that in.

The responses that we got, all of these responses, thousands of them, there is quite a bit of analytical reasoning that went into the divisions that were used here, not all of which I can explain. It is explained in the first chapter of the book, and I got that back about four months ago, and I read it very thoroughly, and I have re-read it two or three times since, and I read it this morning, and all I can say is that I do not understand it.

The geographical regions are easy enough. You have

the New England states, Western region, Middle Atlantic states, Northwestern region, North Central states, and Southern states. By and large they used the categories of states as they are used in the accrediting agencies throughout the United States.

You will notice in the west you have the Western region, and then the Northwestern region, for a reason which is also explained in there which I remember seeing several months ago, but which I could not find this morning, and I am embarrassed about it. They did not follow the accrediting agencies out on the west coast but divided those up differently. That is why you get a Western region and a Northwestern region.

Now just to give you an idea of how these things came in. I compiled the results of the different categories of respondents and by and large they are permissive in the order in which they are listed there. The New England states are the most permissive. The Western region, that would be California and that southern-western area, they were second most permissive. Then the Middle Atlantic states, then the Northwestern region, then the North Central states, which is where I come from, and the Southern states.

In regard to the five acceptable speakers, actually the highest percentage of acceptability for those was the Middle Atlantic states rated first, Western region second, and New England third. How you explain this, I do not know, but that is the way it came out.

Within there, it was the Deans of Men, incidentally, who drove that New England states into the third position in regard to acceptable speakers. How you explain that, I do not know, but these are the queer things that come out of your statistics.

As regards controversial, that group of eight speakers which was in the middle, you will notice that the New England states was the most permissive, the second was the Western region and then, so help me, you go all the way down to the North Central states, they became third. They are more permissive than the others with regard to the controversial area.

But you get to the highly controversial speakers, notice they line up just exactly as they would line up in general. That is just a little sidelight that I happened to notice as I was going over the statistics, so I put it in here.

You will notice the responses were analyzed in two ways, geographical regions, and then by ten categories of institutions, and there is a long explanation in Chapter 1, which is based on a lot of mathematical calculations,

and trying to show that this was the best way to get the percentages to come out right, besides giving an analysis which was intelligible to people.

Again I say, I read it, and I have read it several times and I have some idea of it, but I would not be able to defend all of these categories just as they stand. If Mr. Cowan were here, or Ed Williamson, they could do a better job. But it is easy enough to see.

You take your public institutions, and they divided those into large and small. The figure there, incidentally, which I did not have at the time but which I can fill in for you now, is 8,600. If it is over 8,600 it is classified as a large university; if it is under 8,600 it is classified as a small university. In Chapter I they explain why they took 8,600, because that figure, if you broke it there, you got the best scattering of these universities throughout the United States which would give the best statistics. But the figure is somewhat arbitrary.

The teachers colleges are listed under public institutions and that includes six which are privately controlled, but they lumped those in with all under public institutions, lest the categories become too small and meaningless.

Technical institutions actually were half private and half public, but we listed them here under public, with the note that half of them are private.

Then private institutions are broken up into two categories. You have universities and liberal arts colleges and within each group you have non-sectarian and then Protestant and Catholic. Then under the liberal arts colleges you have non-sectarian, Protestant and Catholic.

Now we are going to be flipping back from page to page, but the figures on the righthand side give you, just in order of permissiveness, how they would rate one after another. It does not indicate too much, but at least it gives you that.

For instance, you will notice that the non-sectarian private institutions -- that would be groups like Harvard, Yale, and so on -- they are the very first in all categories for the acceptable speakers, the controversial speakers, and the highly controversial speakers, they are by far the most permissive.

The second most permissive group -- and this seems to hold pretty regularly throughout--are large universities publicly owned. You will notice that in the acceptable speakers, actually, they are third, but by and large they usually come in second on all of these ratings.

Then the third would be the non-sectarian liberal arts colleges. They are the third most permissive of these groups that are here.

The small universities, publicly owned or publicly controlled, these are the fourth most permissive.

Then if you take the thing backwards, you will find the Catholic colleges and universities are always in the 9th and 10th place, except in regard to the acceptable speakers, and I do not think that is too good a figure to judge permissiveness by.

Then the Protestant universities and the Protestant liberal arts colleges seem always to be just a little bit ahead of the Catholics. We are being very ecumenical now. I can say "being ahead of the Catholics." (Laughter)

The teachers colleges are very, very non-permissive. I guess that is very understandable, but they are.

Technical institutions, I do not think they are very concerned, so they are somewhat in the middle.

So that is the way, by and large, that they rated in regard to speakers coming to campus, and I think that this pattern which you see here is pretty characteristic in what you will find in any of the other studies, in any of the other groupings of the question.

For instance, in regard to fourteen controversial topics, or nine controversial situations, I think you will find in each one of those that the non-sectarian, private college or university is always in the first spot. Then your large state universities, and then it will tie up either your small state colleges or your non-sectarian liberal arts colleges -- those are always the 1, 2, 3, 4, the Catholic institutions are always at the bottom, and the Protestants are just ahead of them, and then in the middle you have the liberal arts colleges and the technical institutions.

Incidentally, if you have any questions at any time -- this is rather routine. I am just trying to take you through the material.

I put in a little N.B. in there, nota bene. This study -- I think it is important that we realize this -- the study is restricted to analyzing the status quo in the spring of 1964, when these questionnaires were passed out with respect to the permissiveness of colleges and universities in the above regions and categories in allowing students freedom to invite off campus speakers of their own choice to speak on campus. The study makes no effort to estimate the compatibility of the various degrees of permissiveness with

the educational mission of the various groups of institutions. If you have read through Ed Williamson's general report, you will find that this is something that he takes up, and he says it has to be a very serious consideration in all of this.

What is the educational mission of the public institution? What is the educational mission of the private school? Then among the private schools, do they have different educational missions? For instance, we excluded from this study the military academies, Annapolis, and the Air Force, and West Point, because we felt they were not characteristic. Their speakers' policies and anything else would not be characteristic of academic freedom. They have a different educational mission. They were so different that we simply put them out of the study.

But within these other groups, and particularly I would say this is true of the Catholic and the Protestant schools, they are very concerned about their educational mission, and any policy that they have in regard to off campus speakers is going to be somehow tied in with this mission.

I personally am not convinced that we have hit it right yet, and that we are doing the right thing. I think we should broaden the acceptability of speakers. I think it would help our mission. But this was the spring of 1964, and this is the way it came out.

Of the 17 speakers, I have already explained why we put 5 of them in the first category, and 8 of them in the second category, and the last 4 down in the third category. As I mentioned before, this is purely arbitrary. You could have grouped them a different way, or you might have put the cut-off points at a different point. But here there seemed to be a clear cut-off.

Just for kicks, I listed over on the side the presidents -- you will see "P", that is for presidents. Then the deans, "F" for faculty chairman, "S" for student presidents. I was very tempted to put "SB" there. (Laughter) And "E" for editors.

You will notice that the presidents picked them 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, just the way they are listed here. By and large it comes out this way. The faculty chairmen you will notice have Humphrey in third place. They reversed the third and fourth spot. But outside of that it is pretty regular.

This was one of the things, incidentally, that the committee was extremely surprised at, the compatibility of the answers across the board. When we designed this study, it was simply our presumption that we were going to uncover a great diversity of opinion between student presidents and student editors, and the president of the institution and the deans and so on. We just presumed that. After all the

questionnaires came in, we were simply floored by finding out that in case after case after case we might as well have sent out only one questionnaire, because they duplicated one another so much. But remember that we did not ask the student editor for his personal opinion. We asked him "How do you view, what is your opinion of what the administration would do?" So this accounts for some of the similarity. But even asking that question, we felt that there would be much greater diversity, that they would see the thing in different ways.

We have just begun to use this whole mound of material that we have, or that John has on cards, to run through the computers up there.

For instance, to me, one of the things I thought of, I wanted to find out what schools are what I call "social mission minded." In other words, what schools produce the most recruits for the Peace Corps? What schools have the most people who are interested in the Civil Rights movement? And if I can get a listing of those schools, then I will send it up to John and have him run it through the machine, and run those schools through the machine, and it would be very interesting to find out if they are permissive schools or restrictive schools, or whether it does not seem to make any difference. I do not know what the answer will be, but I would like to find this out, because I am very interested, and assume all of us are in developing this idea in the minds of our students on our campuses.

Whether it would figure in at all, we do not know, but there are all kinds of things we can do now that we have all this material available.

I think that just about covers it. If you want to look at the acceptable speakers, for instance, I thought it was very interesting to find out that Martin Luther King either had spoken or could speak on over 70 percent of the campuses in the United States, and I looked through the material that had been given to us and tried to find out how about southern schools, and I could not find an answer to that. Do you know, John?

MR. COWAN: Yes, I do not recall the exact figures on that. More than half of the southern schools would permit Martin Luther King. There is a break there -- I have not analyzed this fully -- between the schools with predominantly white enrollment, and the schools with predominantly Negro enrollment. But it is much more than you would expect. I think it is much more than a prejudiced northerner would expect. I think we must be fair here, that there is quite a bit of ferment there. I think, after the study, Martin Luther King became the Nobel Prize winner, and was accepted and certainly given a hero's welcome to some extent in Atlanta. So he represents a point of view on this Civil Rights

business, I think, that is much more acceptable perhaps than we would imagine. He articulates.

DEAN RATTERMAN: I think the point, John, that you brought out, that he received the Nobel prize since then -- this was spring of 1964, and I think the answers might be very different today.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Let me say this is a slippery business. This is a slice in history here, and as you well know, Barry Goldwater went from U. S. Senator to candidate for G.O.P. nomination to candidate for the Presidency, to defeated candidate for the Presidency, all in the time of the development of this; and likewise Malcolm X is no longer a controversial speaker. (Laughter) But I think the fact that he is not a controversial speaker may indicate the fact that he was. As a matter of fact, Daniel Rubin's status has changed too.

DEAN RATTERMAN: I thought this much would at least give you an idea of what we tried to do in this questionnaire.

Would there be any questions that you would want to ask, either about this material, or about the questionnaire in general? Then we could go off, if you want to, into some of the things that bother some of us about this whole movement. Or would there be any questions? Let us entertain those first, about this material, and with John here, I feel we can do a much better job of answering your questions.

... Discussion ensued ...

SEMINAR
"Council of Student Personnel Associations"
Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The seminar convened in the Frederick Room at one-thirty o'clock, Kenneth R. Venderbush, Dean of Men, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin, presiding.

CHAIRMAN VENDERBUSH: This seminar was set up to meet the needs of some of the members of the Association who all of a sudden found themselves confronted with COSPA-HE and not knowing what it means. I know how they felt, because I know when the predecessor IACC first confronted me, it was five years ago when Bill Guthrie was the President of NASPA, and I was his administrative assistant at Ohio State, a year that I was doing some graduate work there.

One of Bill's plans was to begin a little directory of student personnel organizations, and this IACC kept popping up in no category. I thought I had the whole student personnel field figured out by categories, and here was IACC, and I couldn't even figure out what it meant, and he wasn't quite sure, and he was not too sure to whom we should turn for an explanation of it. It was just his vagueness of it, and I thought, "Golly, he is the President and he does not seem to understand it." It was that new, the idea of associations getting together on a kind of regular basis to coordinate the work of the student personnel field.

I think we finally turned to Jack Clevenger at Pullman, Washington, for the description that came out in that first little directory.

The idea that the President of this Association, five years later, as Vic did the other night, should be able to quote a man of Cowley's stature in saying that COSPA is the most auspicious development on the student scene in thirty years, I think means that it has come a long way, that there was a need for it, and something interesting must have been happening that the Association needs to know about.

The Executive Committee has been sending people to COSPA meetings, and I discovered that the Executive Committee really did not understand it too well because we have just gone through, in the last couple of weeks, some correspondence and finally some very intense discussion on COSPA and what it means, and what the part of this Association in it is.

I was glad to see that each of us, in our packets, got these little descriptions that were written by Melvne Hardee, the new secretary of COSPA.

So our program this afternoon is to explain it to you, and Jack Clevenger will do it from a historical point

of view and to give some ideas on where COSPA might go and what part it might play in the future of our field.

I think our program committee has the two best possible men on the subject. Jack Clevenger has been in on it from its IACC days, and he was the first Chairman of COSPA. I remember the excitement that was in the air at Northwestern two years ago as we adjourned, when the people from all these associations were coming together under Jack's leadership, as he went out of office as NASPA President, and COSPA, I think, really got going at that time.

Joe Kauffman, our other speaker, speaks from the point of view of a former Dean about to become a Dean, who has been in Washington, and who has written some things that most of us have seen and read, that mention COSPA as being instrumental in the future of student personnel.

So Jack will be our first speaker. I decided, and I told him I wanted to introduce him, because I thought when a man has been out of the Presidency of an organization for only two years, there are a lot of people in the organization who do not know him as well, perhaps, as some of us think that we do, and an organization that has grown as much as this one has.

Jack has his Bachelor's and Master's degrees from Colorado A & M, and his Doctorate in Education from Stanford. He was the Dean of Students at Colorado A & M, and has now been the Dean of Students at Washington State at Pullman. He tells me he has been a Dean for eighteen years.

Jack was the Chairman of Commission I for a long time. He was the President of NASPA two years ago. He is the Chairman-Elect of the Board of College Student Personnel Institute out at Claremont, formerly the Western Personnel Institute, and he is the first student personnel person on the Committee for Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education. And his work in NASPA and COSPA seem to have qualified him to represent our profession in that field.

So I give you Jack Clevenger, formerly NASPA President, to talk about COSPA.

DEAN J. C. CLEVENGER (Past NASPA President; Dean of Students, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington): Joe Kauffman and I met very briefly at the AHE meeting in Chicago, to decide how we would split this assignment this afternoon.

Our agreement then -- and, Joe, I am still going to try to hold to it -- was that I would try to confine myself to some of the problems of the historical continuum, and perspectives about it as we tried to get this COSPA organization on its feet.

Most of you have had an opportunity, I am sure, to look over this little folder, prepared by Mel Hardee and her graduate students down at Florida State. Mel is the Secretary of COSPA. This is a three year term, and she did a nice piece of work on this. Perhaps you reviewed it. This gives some indication of the history of this infant organization. But I want to go back and try to bring us up to date, if I can.

Actually, this experience at coordinating some of the concerns of the professional associations in the area got started back in 1954 when representatives of ACRAO (the Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers), the American College Personnel Association, AWDC (Association of Women Deans and Counselors), and NASPA got together at a meeting because of the common concern for disciplinary terms and the transfer of records in the cases of students who may have had disciplinary notations on their academic records, to try to bring some degree of coordination, and some common understanding about terms and procedures, since these seemed to be the primary organizations involved.

That was a successful venture. It was really out of this that grew the first attempt in 1958 of the organization that we now refer to as IACC, the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee.

As a member of Commission I, and then as Chairman of Commission I of NASPA, I happen to have attended all of the sessions, five in number, of IACC. I want to talk real frankly about some of the problems as we have confronted them in this growth and inter-association coordination.

The IACC thing, I must say quite frankly, never ever really got off its feet. It was held in conjunction with the APGA circus. I do not want to say that in too derogatory terms, but you know the problems. Some of you men have been at the annual sessions of APGA and, as you know, there are some 3,000 to 4,000 people present, with a number of Associations trying to hold their annual meetings at the same time. So we would schedule sessions for the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee, and one of the problems was that our ACPA representatives could never ever seem to find time to get to the IACC meetings.

The year Bill Craig was President of ACPA, 1962, we met at APGA meeting time. This is always ACPA meeting time, and I think we scheduled either three or four separate meetings of this IACC committee, and Bill Craig, the President of ACPA was never able to get to a single IACC meeting, as the president of one of our important constituent member organizations.

In fact, after the 1962 meeting, I was so discouraged by our attempts to really get some effective coordina-

tion between these organizations that I became convinced that we either had to make some important changes or just give up on the idea, because it really was not working. We were not being productive in any sense of the word.

So we thought that the first change that should be made was to get the annual meeting away from the APGA session. In June of '62 we had -- June of '63 it was, the decision was that we would rotate the meeting place of IACC to follow the annual meeting of the Association of the Chairmen of the committee. In my case, I was to be Chairman of IACC in 1963. So we moved the IACC meeting to the day and a half following the NASPA meeting at Northwestern. We concluded our NASPA session at noon on Friday and we convened then the IACC group free of any other activity of any kind. All that we had to do was to meet and try to get an organization on its feet and under way, Friday afternoon, Friday night, and Saturday following the NASPA convention at Northwestern.

Two things happened at Northwestern that I think more than anything else were the real shot in the arm towards moving into what we now know as the COSPA organization.

We had at that meeting Larry Dennis and Joe Kauffman. Larry Dennis pointed out to us that he thought that ACE was interested in us and was willing to give some staff time and some ACE money towards furthering this new organization. This helped. Also the fact that we had at that meeting representatives of four other professional organizations there as observers.

So at that day and a half meeting at Northwestern, I followed my old proclivity for a series of ad hoc committees. We assigned about half a dozen separate ad hoc committees on structure, organization, program and purpose, and these groups went to work, and we came up with the format of what is now COSPA.

In the meantime, under the direction of Carl Grip, who is here in the back of the room now, we had organized -- and this was under the auspices of the old IACC organization-- the Committee on Student Financial Aids. This was an active and busy committee and made its accomplishments, and made its contributions in spite of the fact that there were some built-in problems. Carl, I want to go back to these for a moment, if I may, if you do not mind.

We had previously organized under IACC a joint committee on training. Alva Brown, O. D. Roberts, and I guess, Bob, you were a little bit involved in it at one time, but we were burdened with this problem of failure really to get organized, and get some direction out of our central yearly meetings, and this created a problem for us, and we must all recognize it. But we had this committee established.

Larry Dennis proposed to us there at Northwestern that ACE would sponsor and pay the bill for a meeting in December at Airlie House, here outside of Washington, D. C. This was for December of 1963. We gathered, as best I can recall, Carl, and some of the rest of you may have been there, Joe -- I think there were about 65 people there altogether. If I recall, at Airlie House, with ACE picking up the tab, our own associations got there, but in terms of housing, food and program expense, and this sort of thing, ACE -- and this was a fairly expensive venture out at Airlie House, and, gentlemen, we had a wonderful two days out there, and the spirit of comradeship and common interest, and the real effort and a real commitment to coordinating the efforts of these professional associations really took off. This was a key point in COSPA.

There were some other things historically that I should mention.

As I took over as President of NASPA in the spring of '62 at our annual meeting at Philadelphia, some of you men will recall that I was mandated by the Association to address a letter to ACE, the Land Grant Association, the Office of Higher Education here in Washington, D. C. and various Congressional Committees. Carl wrote the letter, I did certain minor editing, and we shipped the letter off.

This produced some interesting results. First of all, the Land Grant Association, in its Land Grant Association Newsletter, as soon as this letter of mine that I had signed, that Carl had written, hit that desk there on Massachusetts Avenue, we immediately had a news item in the Land Grant Association Newsletter, "Another Educational Association Gets Into the Legislative Act."

There was a certain amount of disdain in this comment, I thought, but this was the kind of reception we got. Congressman Quie of Minnesota picked up our letter -- he was then, I guess, on the House Committee on Educational Affairs. We got our letter quoted in full in the Congressional Record.

I followed up this letter with a visit in certain Washington, D. C. offices, and this was a real experience for me as the new President of NASPA. This included the federal offices for education here in Washington, D. C., the ACE office, where I visited with Mr. Logan Wilson and Mr. Dobbins.

I was not even sophisticated enough at that time, in terms of the power structure here in Washington, to realize that I should take in Larry Dennis too, so I saw Logan Wilson and Mr. Dobbins, and I visited over in the Land Grant office, and these other offices. And I discovered that I was just one of a series of organizational officers making this Washington, D. C. tour, and with the kind of

comment I was picking up it became perfectly obvious to me that it was high time these people representing some 25,000 student personnel workers in this country began to get together and present some kind of a united front in terms of representing the total interests of the student personnel movement in this country, that biting off our own little separate chunk, piecemeal as it were, and a whole series of us showing up with our own particular vested interests was a mistake.

I am still convinced of this. I am still convinced that, philosophically at least, in terms of presenting the strength in the area that we represent, and of the movement, we damn well better work together and present as strong and as united a front as we can.

We do not only confuse these people in these Washington, D. C. offices, but we confuse our own college and university presidents because at last count, I do not know how many we have -- there are something like 32 or 33 separate, national organizations that deal in this area of student personnel work. This confuses people.

Some place along the line -- and we were pretty well mandated by ACE, as a student personnel movement they made it pretty clear to us, as they offered us a helping hand, that it was high time we put a stop to all this dadgum proliferating of student personnel organizations in all directions at all times. And this is one of the mandates that ACE has put before us.

Well, the shot in the arm that we got from recognition, from the American Council, which in my opinion is still the primary power group for higher education here in Washington, D. C. -- I do not think there is any question about it -- this is where your Congressional committees look to in terms of primary interest in terms of who speaks to Congressional committees about legislative bills that are before the Congress, and in a number of other areas. I still feel that this ACE tie is awfully important. We decided at Airlie House to continue this tie to ACE, that for awhile at least we would hold our own annual COSPA meetings in connection with the annual meeting of the American Council. So last fall, in October of 1964, the COSPA met immediately following the ACE meeting in San Francisco.

Among the other procedural things that we developed was a development of an Executive Committee that was empowered to meet between the annual meetings of COSPA to try to give leadership and some direction to the organization, and we have adopted, as I guess a fairly standard policy, at least by precedent, Parky, if nothing else -- Mr. Parkhurst, who is sitting here, is the current Chairman of COSPA, and he should be the one up here really talking, instead of me -- but we decided to hold our Executive Committee meetings at the AHE

meetings, the Association of Higher Education meeting in Chicago, in March. This gives us a real good tie with the Association of Higher Education.

So the next meeting of COSPA comes this fall. The ACE is meeting the 6th, 7th and 8th in Washington, D. C., and I guess we will pick up at noon at the 8th, and meet that noon, that evening, and the next day here in Washington, D. C.

As you notice from your little bulletin that you have, the Association is now nine associations, but some things have been happening. Our primary effort to date has been (1) to get organized, to have some structure and some organization, and establish some procedures so we could begin to do some things, but our primary effort has rested with two Commissions, the Commission on Student Financial Aid, headed by Carl Grip, and now by our friend Bill, sitting down there, and the Commission on Preparation of Student Personnel work is headed by Tom Emmet, now headed by Miriam Shelden, Dean of Women at the University of Illinois. These have both been highly productive Commissions.

Parky has been pretty busy passing out -- and I think he reproduced this -- Nelson Parkhurst, Registrar at Purdue, is the current Chairman. Parky took this report that Tom Emmet's committee put out and put under cover a proposal for professional preparation in college student personnel work. This has been a hard working committee. Was it Detroit or Boston where I recall this committee alone put in twenty-three hours in session. Was it Boston, twenty-three hours in session there. That has been a pretty productive effort. The people who are involved in it -- you take Frank Knafke, who is the representative on the committee from the Association of College Unions. Frank is really committed to this thing and has been a hard worker on it. And these representatives from ACUHO and from NAWDC and from AACRAO, they are committed to this thing, and they believe in it, and they have been important contributing partners in it.

There continues to be some problems for the people who are trying to decide how we best prepare people for our field of work. Within our own Association, NASPA, there is a bit of conflict at times between the behavioral scientists who say this is the only avenue into student personnel work: that is, the sociologists, psychology, anthropologist type of person. Then we have the College of Education people who train guidance and personnel people, or college student personnel workers, and give a Doctor's degree in it.

I think we will continue to have some conflict between the straight academic discipline and the College of Education type of training that so many of us, including me, tend to represent. But I think we are going to continue, those of us, and all of us do, as deans of students, hire

people. We hire them every year. I do not know about you at Indiana, Bob, but out at Washington State we are going to continue to hire from both fields. The Bill Hilliards that we have out there -- some of you men know him from some of his experience at Kent State, and from Texas Tech. He is running our biggest men's hall, taking a Ph.D. in Political Science. He is not going into Political Science. Obviously he is going into student personnel work, and he is going to make a dandy. We take this type. We take the Bob Ewalds from Illinois, who is taking a Ph.D. in Education, in the College of Education at Illinois. We are going to continue to hire from both types.

This problem of some degree of argument over which is the best kind of preparation, in terms of training for entry into the field, is going to continue to be argued, as sure as you and I are here in this room. But we still need this combined effort, rather than the separate effort.

The Committee on Student Financial Aids, I want to say this: I have worked closely with Carl, who made a monumental effort, and if we need any more evidence than we had this morning from Edith Green, in terms of the kind of questions she was posing, I do not know where we will find it, in terms of the professional student personnel worker having something to say about this federal aid in the area of student financial aids. She posed a whole number of questions, Bill, that I am hoping your committee is already in the process of tackling, and that they will be making some recommendations in this.

I think Joe Kauffman and Larry Dennis can take a lot of the credit for the growth that we have seen in this COSPA idea.

For instance, Bill Van Dusen, from Wayne State, appeared to testify before the committees of both Houses of Congress recently, in connection with the NDEA legislation, the expanded economic opportunities act, and so forth, student financial aid area. Bill represents a member of NASPA but more importantly he is a member of our Commission on Student Financial Aids. I think this is important for all of us to understand.

With due reverence to some real fine men at Harvard, and the scholarship service, and I respect these men, I say here, and I say emphatically, that these men do not represent the total interests of higher education in this country, in terms of student financial aids.

That has been where some of the personality conflict has been in the past. Some of the leaders in Washington, D. C., and in some of the hearings and so forth, have tended to look to Harvard, and to the college scholarship service in terms of advice on legislation in the

student financial aids area. I need not remind you that as I see the current picture across the board, in student services in higher education, the most rapidly growing area that I see is student financial aids. We are all in the process of expanding our offices in this area. Our student financial aid business has trebled in the last three years alone for practically all of us. It has at our place, and I am sure that it has at yours. We are getting organized. We are hiring staff people to handle this area for us. It is the most rapidly single growing area of student services that we have today, and I am simply not satisfied to say -- and Carl has not been; Bill is not now -- to say that Harvard alone and College Scholarship Service alone speaks for all of us in this important area.

All you had to do this morning was to listen to Edith Green and the kind of questions she was posing, in terms of asking the people in higher education, in student services in higher education, what do you think we should be doing? It is an important job for this commission.

Carl was in to it up to his ears. Bill is now. There is a place for this commission. There is a place for joint effort.

Well, I have talked long enough. If I get some questions from the floor -- and I hope you will put some to us -- I will try to answer them.

I want to say this, in conclusion, that I felt all along from the original days of IAAC, that there is as much need at the national level to coordinate the efforts of these separate associations as there exists likewise a need on your own campus. Each one of us on our own campus have a job. This is our responsibility that we are charged with, to provide a coordinated student services program. This is the job of the student personnel administrator on the campus. You have your counselors in your counseling center, whose primary association is the American College Personnel Association, or this little group of Counseling Center Directors that met up at Banff last fall.

You have your physicians and your student health service that have their own association, which, incidentally, has not yet seen fit to come into this Association, and do you know why? Dr. Dunning, of the University of Nebraska, made it real clear to us at Airlie House why they did not want to come in. In their view, they do not wish to be identified as a student service. They want to be something separate that reports only to the president, and they frankly were afraid that if they joined our little COSPA group that they would tend to identify themselves as a student personnel service type of organization on the campus and thus might come under the purview of the Dean of Students or the Vice President for Student Services, or what have you.

But there are exceptions to this. I was impressed with all the exchange of bulletins and magazines and so forth that we now get between our nine participating associations. I have been on the mailing list for the magazine of the Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and I noted with great interest a statement in the President's Column in this last issue of your magazine, Parky, and this was Jim Hitt talking, the President of your Association, that in his opinion the most important single area of development in ACRAO within the last twelve months was in this area of inter-association relationships, and I think Jim was talking primarily about COSPA.

This, gentlemen, with all due deference to you two gentlemen here, this is a big and powerful association in the scene in American higher education, and all of the deans know that the registrar and admissions officer on the campus is a real power figure that you had better be prepared to contend with.

We have enjoyed the relationship, Parky, and I want to speak of my appreciation to you for the kind of leadership that you are providing in this COSPA thing. We are committed to it, and I know that you are. I sat in the meeting with you last night and heard you talk about some of your plans for the future.

I would admit maybe to being a little idealistic about this thing, but I am convinced in my own mind that there is ample opportunity for us to continue to coordinate our efforts without threatening in any way the individual prerogatives or responsibilities of any single Association that participates in this group.

I think there are a few, well selected areas of mutual concern where we can continue to strengthen student personnel work nationally by coordinated effort. I do not want to see us in a position where we get too far over in our ambitions about this organization. I think it has some built-in limitations. Its primary function is still coordination and helping in the team effort to move forward the total interests of the student personnel movement. And I insist that it should not in any way threaten any single Association's responsibilities, activities, prerogatives, or programs.

Well, enough on that.

CHAIRMAN VENDERBUSH: Thanks, Jack. As one who has worked on one of the commissions of COSPA, but not on the council itself, I think I can say, from what I have heard, that it was the force of Jack's personality and persuasion that did get this thing off the ground in the last two years and it is a force in higher education to be reckoned with, and I think it was a treat for me to hear Jack reflect on

these experiences, in a way that very few people can, even in such recent history.

Our other speaker this afternoon -- and after his remarks we will have some questions from you, and we have, as Jack has indicated, most of the leading lights in the recent past are in the room, in addition to which Bob Etheridge, who is our other representative on the Professional Development Commission came in while Jack was talking. So if you have any questions about any of these areas, we certainly will entertain them.

Joe Kauffman, I discovered before this meeting, obtained his B.A. degree from Denver. He was a Phi Beta there. He has his M.A. from Northwestern in sociology, and his doctorate from Boston University in education.

He was the Dean of Students and assistant to the President and Dean of Students at Brandeis from 1952 to 1960, and came to Washington in 1961.

During his first years in Washington, he was Director of Training for the Peace Corps, which I also did not know, in his illustrious career.

For the last two years Joe has been on a joint appointment with APGA and the American Council on Education, and Director of Higher Education for APGA, and consultant in student personnel programs for ACE.

In July he will come to the great state of Wisconsin to become the Dean of Student Affairs at the Madison campus, in addition to which he will have an appointment as Professor of Counseling and Behavioral Studies at Madison.

So it is a great pleasure for me to be associated with Joe before he comes to Wisconsin to take up some of the problems that are waiting for him there.

MR. JOSEPH F. KAUFFMAN (American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.): Thank you, Ken. I understand that your students come down to Madison when they look for excitement. I assume we will be talking on the phone.

I am going to make just brief remarks. We do not have that much time, and I would like to take advantage of at least a number of the people who are here with experience in IAAC and COSPA.

I am not going to be quite as sanguine as Jack about COSPA. I am a little more pessimistic, but I will raise some questions.

I think that COSPA is a very fragile kind of instrument, and that is what it is, an instrument. It is an

idea, and ideas, like the United Nations or any other kind of idea, it is only as good as the member nations, the member Associations, will let it be.

Very frankly, I have perceived some suspicion of COSPA by zealous members of various other associations, that I feel called upon to relay to you. Some of these people are embarrassed to profess these, and yet I do perceive an uneasy feeling that perhaps COSPA will detract from one of the associations or another of the associations that make it up.

It is not a monster. I do not believe it has any potentiality of devouring the member associations, one by one. It has no membership of its own, only your memberships through your association with it.

But I have had, over the last year, individuals probe, discuss, feel out the situation in terms of the future with an implicit kind of frame of reference relating to perhaps this becoming the one over-all student personnel association, and diminishing the others.

I think this is very unfortunate, and I think we ought to deal with it frankly in the question and discussion period.

I can only reinforce some of the things that Jack said. When NASPA sends out its directory, its excellent directory, you people probably find it very helpful, and you do not in any way flinch, but I can tell you that I have seen people take it out of the envelope, people who are not in the student personnel field, and run through the pages quickly, and express shock at the number of different organizations and associations that make up student personnel work, and wonder how to make sense of it, how to relate to it. Isn't this out of hand? How do you go to all these meetings? What does it cost on a campus to send representatives? Do all of them do the same things? And so on. How do they articulate their interests in policy making, and so on?

I think that the existence of a council made up of the major associations is of such importance, I cannot really over-emphasize this. I can tell you that at least in Washington ACE and the other associations, the Land Grant Universities, Association of Colleges, and so on, and some of the government people, that the creation of the Council of Student Personnel Associations has met with a very favorable response, a much more hopeful response than perhaps is deserved at this early stage, but a very hopeful response.

I think one indication of this is the recognition by ACE, and I think, although I cannot predict the future, with Larry Dennis also leaving the Council, I believe we have institutionalized within the Council the notion that one of the senior people, the current Chairman, what not, of COSPA

ought to be a member of the Commission on Academic Affairs, that there will always be a student personnel figure on the Commission of Academic Affairs, and that it will not be a jockeying of whether to alleviate the ill feelings of ACRAO, or NASPA, or ACPA, but it will be someone who represents COSPA, and I think the institutionalizing of this designation may well find its way into other national associations of colleges, universities, and other groups in Washington so that they will be wanting to turn to COSPA for representation, rather than to individual associations.

Some of you may think that your organization is the most important. I would not deny that. You may not like the idea that someone comes to COSPA for a representative person in student personnel work, rather than to your association. This is one of the prices, I think, we pay for forming a council and coordinating things.

A couple of other comments, and then some questions. At the Airlie House meeting in December, 1963, it was Ed Williamson who said that this was the most productive inter-association meeting that he had seen in his thirty years of work in the field, and I want to explain the context of that statement.

It was not in a business meeting, discussing how to form a council or a committee to coordinate things. It was in a context of a two day seminar, made up of representatives of ten of the major student personnel associations, and we were discussing in those two days these issues: The implications for student personnel work; of expanding opportunities for Negroes in higher education; of recent movements in accelerated degree programs, and the year round academic calendar; of the increasing student concern with social issues and student freedoms.

Those were the topics for our two day seminar, and in the context of this, seeing the housing people and the student activities people, and the admissions people, and the financial aid people, and those concerned with discipline and student life and everything else, addressing themselves to an issue which cut across all association lines, this was Ed Williamson's response.

I think it is important that we stress the context of that remark because we become so functional through our division of labor on our campus -- and I do not deny the necessity of this -- but we become so functional that our associations themselves deal with functions and tasks and very little programming is done within associations, or even on campus about the issues which are going to affect us tomorrow and the next day, and in the future, issues which we must address ourselves to as issues, and not as functions. We are trying to deal with students, and students, as students going to school, learning, all of the problems that

are involved in the learning procedure, the learning environment, all of the procedures and tasks, and so on, but not separated from the student as a student.

I would hope that the thrill that Ed Williamson got out of participating in this is not misunderstood as great pleasure and hope in a discussion of coordinating activities. I am not sure what he would say at the end of one of our business meetings, Jack, and this is the real problem, it seems to me. How can we cut across the lines of our various interests and of our various associations, in terms of dealing with various issues that impinge upon all of us since the student passes through all of our hands, whether it is admissions, or placement? How can we do this through COSPA in some very creative and meaningful way?

Well let me raise about four or five questions very quickly, just tick them off for our discussion.

There is the problem of proliferation in student personnel work, and you know it better than I do, on our campuses and in associations. Should there be an association like COSPA, a council like COSPA, which attempts to deal with this? It may be that we ought to give a helping hand to the creation of a new professional association. It may be necessary, or it may be that we would like to re-think the impending move of a new professional association and see if we can broaden our own horizons within on-going associations, and absorb and deal with some of these tasks within our own membership.

The question of what is professional. If this is a profession, I think a council like COSPA should deal with some of the questions about the professional aspects of student personnel work. Is everything going to become a separate profession within the student personnel field? Are some of the things that are done really tasks under an office that is professional? Is everybody who works in the student personnel field a professional of equal degree?

The current scene or mood concerning students strikes me as one that will impinge upon the regional accrediting associations in the next decade, and I would not at all be surprised if regional accrediting associations in re-evaluating member institutions, or in looking at new ones coming up for accreditation would want to consider in their frame of reference something about what happens to students, from admissions to financial aid, to housing, to health, discipline, placement, etc., etc., to the climate of students.

Without an individual on COSPA, I do not know what, say, the middle states association would do. Would they go to the ACAC or college board, or ACRAO to talk about one piece, and somebody else to talk about another piece, and go

around to 15 or 20 different associations, or could we offer them an opportunity, through COSPA, to draw up some guidelines for the whole range of student personnel services, including their administration, and offer personnel from our member associations to serve on teams, or to serve as resource persons?

I think this is the kind of challenge we are going to face, and I hope that COSPA is viable enough to deal with it.

Let me just mention a couple of others. How are we going to relate to legislation and public policy in public education in the next decade without some more unified voice than has existed in the past? It seems to me this is a very logical role.

We have related to ACE and this is partly because ACE came forward. How are we going to relate to the American Council of Learned Societies, and the other kinds of academic groups whom we want to contact or get in communication with about some of the interests that we think faculty ought to have in student problems?

Another area. I am concerned that there are some 75 identifiable professors of higher education in the United States today, from about five a decade ago. These are people who teach courses in higher education. I would make a guess that this number will double in the next five years. How are we going to relate to a group that is going to start meeting among itself, professors of higher education, teaching courses in this, bibliographies, all sorts of goals, and an orientation towards higher education and towards our work? We cannot expect thirty associations to deal with them, or for them to deal with each of us individually.

It seems to me it would be very fruitful for COSPA to attempt to arrange some kind of a conference, once it has itself in order, to invite a representative group of professors of higher education to meet, to talk about the student, and student personnel work, and cooperate in bibliographic material, and research projects, and information, if nothing else. Perhaps even to provide a panel of experts or lecturers or resource people to visit the campuses that have larger programs in higher education, and wish to take advantage of resource people, in admission, and financial aid, and counseling, and other fields.

Another item, the question of ethics. I do not really know the situation in terms of ethics in the individual associations. I know some of them have general statements of principles and so on, but it occurred to me recently in the Stanford case, that we are going to get, in the next few years, a few deans burned, maybe some assistant deans, and maybe some Deans of Women, and maybe some financial aid

people, I don't know. But we are going to get some of our people burned. And some of them are going to come to our individual associations, whichever one they believe in or belong to, and ask for a statement as to their rights as a professional person, a right to due process, a right to a hearing, a right to some kind of judgment as to whether or not they were rightfully discharged.

It would seem to me it would be a good idea for COSPA to consider how it would deal with such matters. We do not have tenure, for the most part, among our memberships. Do we even wish to face this kind of question? I submit that this is a valid kind of question, and much more valid for COSPA than for an admissions officer wondering what his association's stand will be, in ACRAO, and ACAC, and APGA, and everything else all on their own. I think this would be a very profitable area.

I think there is a lot of needed research, data gathering, some joint publications among associations that deal with issues, rather than narrowly defining tasks. I think there are some real issues connected with training.

I will close with that issue by merely saying this: I warned Tom Emmet, back a year ago, that when we pressed for NDEA to include higher education under the counseling and guidance training provision, that if the day came when the vote was favorable we would be asked: "What do you now suggest in the way of training?" And I felt that we were thoroughly unprepared in the student personnel field, unlike the elementary guidance people who had worked out a thoroughly discussed paper through APGA, through ASCA really, unlike the Junior College people who had worked out their own college training programs throughout the years, and had gotten financial support from foundations and so on.

I felt that we were not in a position to say what the Council of Student Personnel Associations would come forth with as their recommendation, united, for its proposals for NDEA support. And I think I have been right, that despite the great efforts of the Committee on Professional Development, we are just now getting to face the question of professional training, and I assume from Miriam Shelden and Bob Stripling's debate, which I could not attend, that you saw the picture of some real difficulty still of even definition as to what kind of training is appropriate under the NDEA frame of reference.

So I would submit that although I am perhaps less sanguine than Jack, and I think that as an instrument COSPA is a terribly fragile kind of instrument that is going to require a great deal of support from the member associations, that there are so many valid and interesting challenges to it, that I hope that I can help make it work. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VENDERBUSH: I think it is safe to say that Joe has done a great deal to make it work already. As he said, ACE came forward to embrace this, and to a large extent he was there in ACE as it was coming forward.

I think, for those of you who were not here yesterday afternoon at the seminar that Dick Gross was Chairman of, when Stripling and Miss Sheldon were -- it was hardly a debate -- when they were speaking, perhaps the issues were not as clear between Stripling, who is a counselor, educator, training, who had a hard time saying the words "student personnel" along with counseling in his presentation, and Miriam Sheldon who is the Chairman of the COSPA Commission on Professional Training in Student Personnel, the issues were not quite as clear as they should have been. There were some holds barred, I was sorry to say. I was hoping there would be blood spilled so that this thing would be clarified for us as an Association, but it was not.

Well, now comes the time when I hope that you will voice some of the questions you may have on your mind about this entire complex COSPA program, this movement that is upon us in higher education.

DEAN CLEVENGER: One additional thing, if I may. You have Nelson Parkhurst, the current Chairman of the Council, and Bob Shaffer, who will be the new Chairman in October.

There seems to be this CIC thing in the Big Ten and the University of Chicago, and it seems to be COSPA related, and I wonder if either one of you two would comment on this?

CHAIRMAN VENDERBUSH: Good question, Jack. Parky.

REGISTRAR NELSON H. PARKHURST (Chairman, Council of Student Personnel Associations; Registrar, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana): I hope you can see at least my hair over this podium. (Laughter) We found out yesterday there is a little button back here, and if you work it right this thing will go down. That is what one of the wires is for, Ken.

I would like to say at the outset, and I do not want to make a speech, although I wrote a few notes down as these gentlemen were talking, and to Joe I would say I think it takes both the sanguine and the less sanguine for an organization of this sort.

I would like to say also that as I envision COSPA, it cannot dominate any of the national associations represented in COSPA. It cannot obligate, financially obligate any of these associations to an extent to which they do not wish to be obligated. Each association that becomes a member agrees to obligate itself financially to the extent of only \$50.00 a year, and believe me, this does simply cor-

response. As Jack pointed out, the little printed copy of this report, COSPA had no money to print. If you want to know how it got printed, I will be willing to have this recorded. I printed it because I wanted to distribute it on the Purdue campus, to the Placement Office, to the people in the field of education, and especially those in higher education, to all of the student personnel offices, and all of the members of the staff of the personnel offices on the campus. I wanted to be sure that several people in the Graduate Dean's office had it.

To me it was worth whatever it took out of my budget to have it in printed form, and I have long felt -- I do not know whether I am right or wrong -- that when you see something in printed form that somehow or other it has just a little more respect than if it is in a mimeographed form.

As I understand it, NASPA has agreed, the Executive Committee has agreed that this will appear in your Journal, for which I am deeply grateful, and I am sure that all of the members of the Council are grateful.

It has, for the most part, appeared in ACRAO's news letter already, and I hope that other organizations will take up this cause and distribute the combined thoughts of your representatives on this Council as they progress to do other things.

I would like to just list for a second -- and I will only list these things, Joe, less briefly than you did -- some of the things that we hope to discuss, at the Council meeting following the ACE meeting in October 1965.

The first item on here is accrediting. There has been a Commission of the old IAAC on accreditation. This Commission somehow or other did not get off the ground, as did many others, unlike the one that Carl Grip and Tom Emmet headed.

We have one on placement, just an idea on placement. Placement is really a two-pronged term, as I would envision it in COSPA. When we are talking about the people -- that is most of our associations have some sort of placement group, but there is very little interaction between the placement groups. We know very little about them.

Data and definitions is another, and certainly we are still not sure that any of us know what a student really is. Bob Mahn, who is the President-Elect of ACRAO, was one of the people who has worked on this business of data and definitions for a long time. ACRAO has a standing committee and the Council has agreed that ACRAO should continue to take the lead in pulling up to date their handbook on data and definitions, and that it should involve the cooperation of representatives of all of the associations.

We do not know much about our publications, and we would like to know what are the publications. We would like to see somewhere a composite list of all of the publications of the COSPA member associations.

The very first thing that probably in the history started this organization was the old problem of discipline records. We have dropped it. It needs to be revitalized and brought up-to-date.

Professional development, I think, while we may be off the ground in terms of this first report, as Joe has said, we have not gotten to first base yet, and I will mention the CIC movement in just a moment, in connection with that.

Financial aids. Carl has worked with this for a long time, and his Commission, as Jack said, has done a very excellent job. Bill now has the Chairmanship of this Commission. Bill, I too hope that you can answer some of the questions that are posed by Edith Green. On the other hand, I am not sure that all of them have answers.

We need to look, I think, at the national scene, and this, Joe, is a subject all of its own, but it has many, many ramifications. I would ask one or two questions.

Does every one of our associations need a national office of its own? The Kauffman report most of you have seen and read, the one that was made to the Commission on Academic Affairs of ACE, and which set the stage for the theme of the ACE meeting next fall, which is to be centered around the student, included in it a statement about the proliferation of organizations. When we look at the national scene, then I think we have to think in terms of proliferation, which Joe mentioned. In his thinking, he also mentioned the fact that perhaps we should sponsor a new association. In my opinion that new association is going to be financial aids.

What should all of our various associations -- should we sit by and see an organization spring into being on a national level and say nothing as to how it should be organized, how it should be structured? What kind of things should be expected of it?

I think if we all sit still, it will come. It will come like all the rest of our organizations, and perhaps we can lend some guidance to the formation of such an organization.

Another group that has sprung up in the last year, or perhaps I should say is in the process of being born at the present time, is another council, a Council on High School-College Relations. Many of our organizations have high school-college relations committees. This Council, I think, will come into being, whether we want it to or not,

Joe. I am not sure that it should. In fact, Joe, I think, knows that I was hopeful that ACE might reactivate a commission that it once had on high school-college relations, and that ACE would then have this rather than the springing up and the formation of a new organization. But that did not happen.

Well, these are just some of the ideas that we have in mind. Now with respect to this, how do we expect to operate next fall?

In the very near future I expect to ask people who hopefully are knowledgeable people -- and I might say the night before last in Tom Emmet's suite we had an awfully good discussion and we got a lot of ideas, and many of these ideas came from this session, some of them from my mind, some of them from Tom Emmet's mind, and as you know, Tom spawns ideas about half a dozen a minute, and he has a lot of language to go with them.

Well, these are some of the things that we are thinking about. I think that we have hit, in our thinking, most of the things, Joe, that you brought out. We have not hit this point of ethics yet, and I think this would be a good addition, and I would ask you one question, and let you try to answer it, if you will. I am indebted to a person in this room for even having the question to ask.

Should the staff member who commits an unlawful act be protected and exonerated while the student who commits the same kind of act is expelled? It is a pretty good question.

As for the term that Joe used, "hopeful response," Joe, I hope that in the not too distant future there can be more than just a hopeful response for COSPA.

Now to answer the question that was posed with respect to CIC. Miriam Sheldon, Ed Williamson, several people have been involved in much of the discussion of NDEA institutes, the establishment of institutes involving higher education, and they have also been involved with COSPA, they have been involved with our associations, and they came to me, as Chairman of COSPA, because I also was in a midwest institution, saying, "We think the CIC institutions -- and this involves the Big Ten and the University of Chicago -- ought to plan some kind of program for training of people who are planning to enter the professional fields in student personnel areas."

That word "professional" was bandied about in the discussion here yesterday too, by the way.

We had what we call an exploratory meeting in Chicago, with ten people there. Two of these people repre-

sented the academic field, and eight people represented the organizations, or the associations now in COSPA. Now they did not represent the organizations. I should say they represented the fields represented by the organizations in COSPA. We had a strictly exploratory meeting. We decided that we needed more of these academic people in, that we needed to have, as they would say, dialog with them, and so we decided to have a second meeting, and at the second meeting we tried to get at least one person from the academic area, preferably someone concerned with the field of higher education, and if possible someone interested in student personnel, and this, I might say, is in its very infancy. We must have more dialog, some more debates like the one we had yesterday. I think that was wonderful.

We also tried to have two people again representing the eight organizations, or the eight areas represented in COSPA. We had, I think, twenty-five people at this meeting, and we had a pretty good discussion, and I might say that Joe Kauffman was there and contributed, and I might say that the CIC institutions are fortunate that Joe Kauffman is going to be there, and I think that he will probably make a great contribution toward any development that may come.

We do not know yet what will be done, but we did pass some resolutions, and these resolutions, essentially, were presented to CIC, which is a committee representing the Big Ten schools and the University of Chicago, and we asked them three things:

First, for encouragement.

Second, for endorsement, and

Third, for support.

They gave us the encouragement. Essentially they endorsed the resolutions that we presented to them, and they said, in addition to that, "When you have presented us with a proposal that we can look at, that we can support, we will then consider the support question."

So I think we are at that stage now where we either have to move, or if we do not we are going to continue to flounder. I think perhaps CIC is in the same situation.

CHAIRMAN VENDERBUSH: Thank you very much, Parky.

What questions do you have from the floor?

... Discussion ensued ...

SEMINAR
"National Associations for Student Government"
Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The seminar convened in the Richmond Room, at one-thirty p.m., Dean Earle W. Clifford, Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: What we are going to try to do this afternoon, to the extent that our time and our resources allow, is to try to put some attention to the question of the implications of the Williamson report for student government generally, and for national student government in particular.

We are going to try -- and in my experience so far in the Conference, this may be the first effort that has some possibility of achieving, largely because of the numbers -- we are going to try to have a seminar, instead of a panel presentation and discussion. We have labeled the program "seminars," but because of the numbers here it has been my impression that most of the seminars have been largely something less than that. We are going to try to have one.

As a matter of fact, if it is at all possible, we would like to convert this seminar into an attempt at the model that Williamson might have us engage in, perhaps minus our colleagues on the faculty, although some of us have faculty responsibilities and could wear that hat, at least a little bit.

The panel members, for the first time in my experience at NASPA, bring together the top leadership of the major national student government organizations in the country. If this is a "first," in view of the Williamson report, I hope we can take full advantage of it.

We plan to terminate this seminar at three o'clock. When the seminar is over, the national student government officers who are here will stay to exchange with any of you issues, questions, concerns, debate or what have you, regarding your own campuses, and regarding their organization.

The panel: On my right and your left -- and this is the first time NSA has been on my right (laughter) -- is the President of the National Student Association, Stephen Robbins, from whom you have already heard in a very fine fashion. I think it was yesterday, although my contact with the program is a little bit loose at this point.

To his right is Miss Sally Jo Vasicko, who is the President of the Intercollegiate Associated Women Students.

To her right is Mr. Jon Mastin, who is the President of an organization that you may not be too familiar

with, the International Association of Evening Student Councils.

On the far left, for obvious reasons, is Miss Nano Byrnes, who is the Programs Vice President of the National Federation of Catholic College Students.

Next to me is Mr. Thomas Johnson, who is the President of the Associated Student Governments of America.

Our format is going to be as follows: Very briefly -- and they have been advised that exposition is the least important item here, and exchange the most -- very briefly, each of the seminar participants will present to you what they see to be the mission of their national student government organization, and what comments they wish to share with you regarding the role of student government generally. We will then go into an exchange among ourselves, very briefly too, on the implications of the Williamson report for national student government. Then, as quickly as possible, into a seminar style exchange among us, extending the issue of the implications of the Williamson report for national student government.

I am going to call -- not for any real reason -- on the seminar participants from my left to my right. So I will call first on Miss Nano Byrnes, who is Programs Vice President of the National Federation of Catholic College Students. Miss Byrnes.

MISS NANO BYRNES (Programs Vice President, National Federation of Catholic College Students): I represent the National Federation of Catholic College Students, which is a branch of the National Council of Catholic Youth of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. As if that weren't bureaucratic enough, we federated 125 student governments of Catholic colleges and universities throughout this country. It can be said that we are the voice of about 150,000 students in this country.

On a national level, our main areas of programming fall into four areas: International affairs, social action, religious affairs, and student affairs.

These secretariats, as they are called, are located on member campuses throughout the nation. These campuses bid for these secretariats every year at our national congress. Together with the National Newman Club Federation we publish the Catholic Student News Service. This joint effort has led to plans for a merger with the National Newman Club Federation within the next two years. Therefore it will be a National Catholic Student movement.

Also, we are completely financed by students, both by dues and through a travel program, which is organized for

students and is open only to students from member campuses.

Our student government link is the most important thing about our Federation. Our Federation depends for its very life upon student government. It is with this in mind that I make these remarks and observations about student government, but I should say, first, that the people to whom I originally thought I would be speaking are not here, and those that are here are not the ones to whom I am speaking, when I am speaking of Catholic colleges.

Generally speaking, Catholic colleges are the second to the last bastion of the authoritarian church. We feel they are second to the last, because as Father Greenley once said, the parish is the first, or the very last. This characteristic therefore covers the whole fabric of student government and student life, to the point that the following observations can be made.

There is an evident lack of communication on the Catholic campus where there are definite and separate administration, faculty and student factions. If the university is by definition a community of scholars, this, of course, should not be the case. On most Catholic campuses there are student government, and an administration, and I do not really know where the faculty comes in. Each carries out prescribed roles which seem to include a perpetual circle of one-upmanship, rarely listening to or communicating with the other. In this kind of atmosphere is it any wonder that there really is a lack of communication?

The second observation is that Catholic campuses are prone to regard student government as a part of a labor-management bargaining situation. We heard this yesterday referred to as negotiation versus participation. Even so, with this connotation in mind, of the bargaining situation, I think that the labor unions have one very distinct advantage, the right to strike, and to lodge a formal protest, and be assured that it will be taken seriously.

Because of the prevalence of this attitude, student government presidents on more than one campus have been elected because of their attitude toward the administration, their anti-administration attitude. This situation is ridiculous.

The earlier reference to the sectionalism within the college community is based on the observation that student government on Catholic campuses seems to be responsible for very little more than mere welfare functions -- filling a social calendar, dances, keeping the student Union neat, holding referendums on whether or not to have a coffee machine installed, and Christmas preparations.

Meanwhile, issues that affect the very heart and

essence of college life, and the purposes of the college, are discussed by esoteric groups which may or may not be responsible to the college community as a whole.

With student government relegated to welfare functions, it seems to me that it does very little more than waste everyone's time.

As the situation stands now, student government charts its course only through safe and untroubled waters. Whenever it goes beyond the ordinary welfare role ascribed to it, general tension ensues, and the tension is another product of this pseudo communication, with neither faction really understanding the goals of the other.

There is another element present too, but this is one that I call the risk component, but it is better described as "will they or won't they make a mistake?" It has been the feeling of many that a few mistakes would not hurt anybody, not even a student government.

Number 5: The general tenor of students on the campus, on most campuses, is satisfaction with the bread and circus type of student government. More and more, however, students are demanding a different attitude on the part of their duly elected officers and representatives. Unfortunately, the vision of the student government president with this kind of constituency is not yet, or not always in line with that of the administration.

Therefore, it is my position that student government in its present situation is unrealistic, divisive of the college community, and in most cases unnecessary.

We do have a constructive suggestion to make as a Federation, however. We would hope that the beginnings that we see of a movement toward community government would take hold. This is the participation about which we spoke yesterday. Catholic colleges find themselves in the throes of institutional change. I propose that these changes be made as a community, with all facets of the college involved in the planning. If all of the college community were responsible for major aspects of that institution, there would be really no need for student government. Wouldn't this be more honest than the exercises in futility that we now see?

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Thank you very much.

Our second panel seminar participant is the President of the Associated Student Governments, Mr. Thomas Johnson.

MR. THOMAS D. JOHNSON (President, Associated Student Governments): Thank you, Dean Clifford.

To enter this discussion, and show you the place we feel the Associated Student Governments hold, I would like to go into a little bit of what we feel is the philosophy of the university first.

The university, of course, is an educational institution, and it is designed to educate the student. All of its services and so forth are directed to the student. This education is brought about in two ways. First, inside the classroom, with a normal, formal curriculum; and outside the classroom, in the many extra-curricular events -- a cultural program, lectures, concerts, and so forth, the athletic program and the participation in that -- and we feel an important part of this is the student government.

Student government, therefore, is an educational group. It can provide many types of educational programs for the students, in addition to his normal curriculum, to help him become a well rounded man.

Student government also provides its own services to students in many different forms.

Now where does ASG fit into this?

ASG is an organization existing solely for the communication of information. We feel that the more information a student government has to work on, the better organized their programs can be, the more mature and the more responsible its action is.

In order to do this we provide the student government Reference Manual, which is a handbook for student government leaders, giving outlines of programs used on campuses all over the country. We feel that the innovation and the new ideas brought about by seeing what other schools have as their programs is the most important part in keeping student government on the move.

We also have a convention every year, which is very similar to this one. We have seminars on many different facets of student government. Some of these I might read through quickly: academic affairs, which includes honor systems and service projects for both the community and the student body. For instance, on the Purdue campus we have the Student Volunteer Corps, which has people who work in neighborhood houses, and help with the hospital, and so forth. This is a type of activity which student government can create.

We also have public relations, international student programming, national and international affairs, and the internal structure of student government, which we would also like to help grow so that the student government itself will be effective. This includes judicial matters, fiscal

affairs, campus election systems, and so forth.

So basically the Associated Student Governments is a means of communicating information and helping student governments become more effective by sponsoring mature and responsible programs.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: The third seminar participant to speak will be Mr. Stephen Robbins, who is the President of NSA.

MR. STEPHEN J. M. ROBBINS (President, United States National Student Association): NSA was founded in 1947, primarily in response to a series of international meetings which were held in 1946. Since that time we have accumulated a membership of some 300 student governments, representing approximately 1,500,000 students. The growth has been sporadic and in some sense cyclical.

The types of programs that we run are for the most part extremely varied and represent the many interests of students, as indicated through their student governments at the annual National Student Congress of the Association, which is held each year in the last two weeks of August in some midwestern school.

Generally speaking the programs can be divided into four or five main areas, the first of which is educational affairs, involving student participation in the governance of the institution, student participation in effecting various changes in the interest of students in the institution as a whole, financing higher education with respect to both private and public institutions, and so forth.

Another area of concern is community involvement. This ranges from programs such as tutorial projects for slum areas, involving students through their student government in improving the level of ambition and expectation in areas of normally low levels, and on the other extreme, perhaps, if you will excuse the word, literacy programming in the south, particularly Alabama and Mississippi.

A third area of concern is the area of academic freedom and student rights. I will go into this in somewhat more detail when we speak a little bit later on the Williamson report, and NSA's position with respect to that report.

Generally speaking, we have attempted since 1947 to defend the rights of students with respect to political organization, due process, disciplinary action, etc.

The fourth main area is general student government concern, such as attempting to provide assistance to student governments in the development of various constitutions, general programming, leadership training, etc. This also

includes such things as cultural programs, providing assistance for campuses which are attempting to organize cultural festivals, art, music, theater, what have you. Also student services and welfare, such things as discount programs, travel programs, and so on. Normally we assist students traveling to Europe, South America, and the Far East, in the numbers of somewhere between 25,000 and 50,000 a year. That is in terms of direct assistance by providing various services for them.

Another major area of concern is international affairs. As I mentioned, the formation of NSA was in large part a response to a feeling by certain delegates who had attended a meeting of the International Union of Students in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in the summer of 1946, that one of the reasons that that meeting had been dominated by people of a particular partisan viewpoint was because no effective American participation had been present. These people came back and helped to form NSA, and since then we have been very active in the international scene, helping form in 1950 the International Student Conference, which sits as essentially a democratic, non-partisan organization, in contrast to the International Union of Students, which is essentially dominated by the Soviet point of view.

We have supported fully that Conference since that time, and have extended many resources, attempted to establish various scholarship programs, technical assistance programs, to the unions of especially the developing areas, and in an attempt to develop with them some sort of appreciation for western values, particularly freedom and democracy, in specific terms, and attempted to bring them to the United States, and to western countries to see these forms of government in action, as well as to receive an education so that they may return to their countries and contribute not only to the technical aspects of the development of that country, but also to the political aspects in the hopes that these countries will develop committed to the same ideals that we believe our society is committed.

The finances of the Association are, for the most part, not student contributed. Five percent of the total expenses of the Association are borne by the dues which we receive from the member schools. The other 95 percent comes from foundation support for our various programs. The Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs provides the single heaviest contributor. It is the Corning Glass sponsored foundation, and they are very interested in our international activities. In addition we have received funds from Ford, Rockefeller, New World, Sterne, Independence, Faneuil Hall, and many of the other foundations with which you are familiar.

Finally, I would like to address myself specifically to the question of what NSA believes student government

should do on a philosophical basis. It is our belief then that the university and the college experience is the most important part of the individual's career. It is here that he receives the best education in terms of quality that he will receive during his lifetime. It is here also that it is sort of an end to his idealism, in a very real sense. His idealism is at its height. It is at this time that he may take the most advantage of his somewhat independence, from the pressures that will exist on him as a professional individual. It is here that he can critically examine the values of his society, accepting those which are proven to have been of benefit, and things which he believes to be of real utility, and which conform to those principles which he has assimilated during his previous educational career.

The combination of these two factors, idealism and the critical perspective, and the superior educational experience which is available to him, we believe puts him in the best position to develop certain criteria, certain standards, which he will apply later in his life.

We also believe that the university should provide a total educational experience. That is, in an ideal sense, the university should prepare individuals to cope with what they are going to cope with after they leave the institution.

This means, first of all, of course, that they must receive technical training, training which prepares them to exist and develop professional talents which will, in essence, earn them money, but which will also contribute to social and economic development.

Secondly, he should be exposed in whatever capacity is possible to all of those types of things which he is going to be exposed to later in his life. Because he is in an educational institution, he will be able to examine them somewhat more critically and objectively than he ever will be able to do later. Because he is much freer, relatively speaking, than he will be after he has a family and a wife, and so on, and professional obligations, his ability to do this criticism is also at its maximum point.

We believe that student government should cooperate in this total educational process. We believe that student government should be concerned with the total range of this educational experience in the complete sense. That means, among other things, that we are committed to an ideal of student freedom, that in order to experience the total possibilities of what may be available to him during that four year period, that it will be necessary for him to have as much freedom as possible. That is not to say that we believe that he ought to be able to run stoplights, or murder people, or anything else, as sometimes people indicate when they talk about NSA. It just means that we are committed to maximizing freedom within responsible limits -- freedom

within restraint, as Dr. Williamson has put it in his report.

We also believe that a number of co-curricular programs are essential, since students are committed to accomplishing certain degree requirements while they are at the institution and it should be sponsored by the student government, cultural affairs, etc.

Perhaps another area of friction between NSA and administrations is that because we believe that man is a social animal, and because he should be involved in the examination, criticism and improvement of the social environment, we believe that when he gets out is not the time to learn how to critically analyze society, that this learning process should occur within the institution itself. And one essential ingredient in that process is his actual participation within the community. We do not believe in the ivy tower. We do not believe that a realistic analysis of the society is possible unless the student himself participates in the society. Therefore, we encourage the student to take part in political parties, be they Republican, Democrat, States Rights, or what have you. We believe that the student should be concerned with the problems that face the community, as both a citizen and a student. As a citizen, because all citizens are concerned. As a student because he is in the best position of his lifetime to analyze critically and objectively with the assistance of the many resources that are available at his institution, the social problems which confront the environment.

Therefore, our programming is very largely directed in these areas. It is directed at getting students out into the society while they are still students, not only to participate, not only to be actively concerned, but also to approach that concern from an educational point of view, with a critical perspective, which is his opportunity.

Some of the programs, for example, that we take an active part in developing, are tutorial programs, community day centers, illiteracy projects in the south, and what have you. In doing, we try to put a special educational emphasis on those programs. Nevertheless, they are commitments to social reform in a certain sense. We have some 25 staff members who deal in all these areas, ranging from international affairs -- that being the most remote -- to the local educational problems and student freedoms. They assist the student governments in developing programs of local value. We do not attempt to impose any particular programs, although we do set up models and standards at our National Congress. We believe that in setting up a program that this indicates a priority, this indicates a certain interest, and because we attempt to be a democratic organization we believe that that priority and interest should be expressed in a formal sense, i.e., through resolutions. This sometimes gives us a label as being political. This has been unfortu-

nate in some ways in the effect that it has had on certain individuals. Nevertheless, we believe this is the best way to approach the development of programs.

In doing those resolutions, these set the priorities for the national officers and staff in assisting the student governments during the year, and during their programs. It is up to the student governments to avail themselves of the services and resources that NSA offers. We cannot, for a number of reasons, go on to a campus and tell them what they ought to do. If they do not decide to take part in our programs, then that is their prerogative. The constitution of NSA provides that they may dissent from any point of view, that none of our positions are binding on any individual school. As such it means, of course, that if certain student governments are relatively inactive or unconcerned, they will not avail themselves of the resources of our organization, and thus their membership is of dubious value.

These are the things which we believe in, and these are the things we attempt to do on our limited scale.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: The second lady, Miss Sally Jo Vasicko, who is the President of the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, will address the questions which I posed at the beginning. Sally.

MISS SALLY JO VASICKO (President, Intercollegiate Association of Women Students): Thank you, especially with the comment "lady."

As a national student body, our organization, the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, is dedicated to cultivating an attitude which prepares women to govern themselves throughout their college careers, thereby increasing their ability as well as their desire to fulfill the role of the educated and competent woman in today's democratic society.

The need for such an organization of the scope and structure of IAWS came from the need for women to accept, adjust to, and develop the powers achieved by them through social, political and academic equality.

The foundation for IAWS was laid at the first conference of the Intercollegiate Association of Self-Governing Bodies at the University of Ohio in May, 1913. The following year, in 1914 a constitution was formulated and adopted at the University of Illinois.

Now you might wonder, the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, exactly what are its purposes and intents?

Number one, to consider problems relating to the

role of educated women, and their responsibilities in local, national and international areas of concern, and to promote a sense of responsibility and awareness of the obligations of college women to their community, and to their world. To foster an exchange of ideas, information, and policies on subjects of mutual interest to the member schools of the Association. Finally, to exist for the sole purpose of education, and this education can and must be translated and incorporated into the active life of each collegiate woman.

Our structure is as follows: We are divided into four regions, with each region being run by a National Vice President and a Regional Coordinator. We have a National President who serves for one year, and Executive Secretary, and a National Editor. We also have a Clearing House Chairman who serves as a distribution center for programs of interest to the various 260 member universities and colleges.

The benefits that we offer our members include: We provide a channel of communication by which national problems affecting women students can be brought to the national and local attention of individual women students. We also provide a stimulation for participation of campuses in community affairs, through conventions, publications, and committee work.

Our Association prepares women to increase their ability and desire to fulfill the role of the competent educated woman in today's democratic society.

As for the views of this Association toward national student governments, perhaps we can summarize them in the following way. We believe that the national student body or student associations thereto provide an education, the education of its members, through national, regional or state conferences. At these conferences, the national association should expose its members to new and traditional aspects of current trends and thinking, whether they are political, economical, social, or what have you.

The national organization has the responsibility of not only increasing the members' awareness of the perfection of this on individual programs on their campuses, but also of increasing the awareness of the individual schools to those matters which concern America's academic, social and political thinking.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Jon Mastin, who is the President of the International Association of Evening Student Councils, is our anchor man, and I will ask him now to address himself to these two questions.

MR. JON D. MASTIN (President, International

Association of Evening Student Councils): Thank you, Dean Clifford.

I have heard the Dean of my college say that when he first became a Dean and used to go to Conferences, he would get up and tell what a wonderful program he had, and what a wonderful evening student council he had, and how they did not have any problems. And he said, as time went on, he began to find out that it was just the new people who did that, so I will try to spare you this afternoon, and tell you that we do have some problems, and all our programs are not wonderful.

First, I must say that I represent a different breed of cat, so to speak, from the other people here, because the students who are members of IAESC are usually drawn from an urban university. They used to be known as the streetcar colleges, and somewhat dangerously I might point out some of the statistical differences between the day student and the evening student.

On the average we are five years older. And we have six-tenths more of a wife -- whatever that means. (Laughter) We also have a sticky problem with one and a half more children. (Laughter) And we have a work commitment of 40 hours a week, plus commitments to the community itself, socially and politically.

Unlike day students, evening students usually have what I would call a more real commitment to their community. They are a participating member of the community in that they have lived here and been established longer than the day student usually is.

One thing I might point out is the motivational level of evening students. There are some evening professors who will really argue with you about this point, but most evening students are in college because of the sociological, technological demands of our society. In other words, it is impossible to be competitive without a college degree. And if you have a college degree, it is impossible to keep up without continued study. We are in the era now when the Ph.D. being hired now is being asked, "How much postgraduate studying have you done?"

I might point out further, one student out of every three in college is attending classes in the evening. This is a very significant part of the total student population that is engaged in full time-part time study. The rate of enrollment in evening colleges is increasing at more than twice the rate of increase of enrollment in day schools.

Some of the purposes of my organization include creating an awareness of the needs of these students, awareness of their needs in the business community, since we are

a part of this, awareness of our needs in the educational community since we are a part of the educational community, and an awareness of our needs in our own family because it is awfully hard for a wife to understand why you have to go down to the university on Sunday afternoon for four hours, when you were down there Monday night, Wednesday night, Friday night, Thursday night for a meeting, and Saturday morning for two hours also.

Evening education has a lousy image. For professors there is a real stigma attached to having to teach a class after five o'clock. It is almost like having a bad case of leprosy and I hope that one of these days it will be changed.

Evening education, or evening college and students, has been termed to be a posterior pain to the "publish or perish" criteria because "how am I going to get that darned book written if I have to go down there two or three nights a week and teach a bunch of people who have been at work all day and are not really interested in what I have to say?"

There is one thing here that I would like to point out, which really concerns me, and I am taking some liberty here, Dean Clifford, in doing this, but the Council of Graduate Schools wrote a statement to the President of the AUEC a couple of years ago and in effect said, "It is questionable whether the encouragement of part time study for degree is in the national interest. We need more scholars, more teachers, more scientists as fast as we can prepare them, not as slowly as suits the convenience of part time students."

I ask this: When was quality education a function of time? IAESC historically began five years ago. There are over two million students enrolled in accredited courses in evening college, and you can now add about another third of a million who are in educational programs for non-credit.

Knowing what happens in day education, as this report this last few days has pointed out, is helpful to us, but it is not always applicable because we live under a different set of criteria. There are a lot of differences between day student councils and evening student councils. I sat here and listened to Steve and Tom and also listening here to Sally Jo as they told about their organizations, and I found out that IAESC is not an NSA, not an ASG, and it is very definitely not an IAWS.

Our functions and our purposes incorporate some of their functions and purposes, and perhaps we have some that they do not. Perhaps the most significant thing that is happening in our organization now is that we are trying to begin to find out what our role is in the hierarchy of the evening administration. In other words, what do we have to offer to the administration of a college, as an evening student council?

I will tell you right now, we do not know. Some of the things that I have heard here in the last few days may give me an indication, or our group an indication of what some of the things should be.

Some of the freedoms that evening students pursue are a little bit different than those of day students. A lot of the freedoms that day students are after we already have.

The significant thing I would point out here is that the freedom or the right that an evening student wants is that of a quality education, because he is in school eight or ten years, and we say that the half life of a college education is about ten years. He has to have something pretty good when he gets out, or he is not going to have anything.

Another question that comes to my mind is concerning this survey. I hope maybe this may take us in the right direction to get started. Here we had a model, and we stopped this whole dynamic process of education and took a look at it. We forced somewhere around 4,000 people to take a look at student freedoms, and every moment we sit here the changes that have happened in education due to this survey, and to the thoughts and the awareness of student freedoms, is growing further and further from what this paper says it is. In fact, it is probably changing exponentially with the time elapsed.

So I would say that this study, the important thing has been not what did it reveal, but what has it done to change attitudes or thinking, or even get people to thinking in this area of student freedoms.

Very quickly, I would reiterate by saying that the purposes of my organization are that of attempting to establish a liaison or a rapport with the business community, with the academic community, and with the social community.

In the academic area we would like to develop an interchange between students and with deans and faculty members or administration, and student personnel workers.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Thank you, Jon.

In his presentation Steve indicated that he looked forward to expressing NSA's position on the Williamson report. Clearly NSA is moving fast if, since yesterday, it has a position. I would like to begin by giving him the opportunity to express NSA's position on the Williamson report, and then turn this discussion to focus on the question of how each of these national student government leaders consider their organizations should be involved in the implementation of the mode that Williamson suggests is the vehicle for the achievement of freedom, namely, what I would think would be best described as local seminars.

Where does the National Student Government organization fit in this equation?

I would like to hear what NSA's position is on the report first, if I heard right, and I think I did, that they have one already. That is organization. Steve. (Laughter)

MR. ROBBINS: I really wasn't aware that I used the word "position." If I did, I must apologize, because what I attempted to say is that I was going over a number of areas of concern of NSA, one of which was academic freedom, and as I recall, I said I would go into that in greater detail when we proceeded to a discussion of the report.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Just address yourself to the question then.

MR. ROBBINS: That is the question of what NSA's reaction to the report is?

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: No, what I think I am really more interested in is, let us assume that the report poses for us a procedure and an approach to the achievement of freedoms which we are all interested in, desirable freedoms in line with this report. I am interested to know from each one of the seminar participants, how does the national student government get involved now, in the implementation of this, on a local campus scene? How does ASG, IAESC, IAWS and the rest of the alphabets here, participate with us? We are a national seminar here in effect today. I take it we are not going to, at least at this point, we have made no decision regarding NASPA's role in the implementation of this on the local scene, and so perhaps this is a little unfair.

I would like to see, in the context of the discussions that have gone on, how each of these national student government leaders see the role of their national organization on the local scene in the implementation of this procedure or process to desirable freedoms that are posed by the report. And that is the question I would like you to talk to, Steve.

MR. ROBBINS: Well, in the sense of what Dean Clifford did, I think correctly, is anticipate that we are somewhat perhaps prompt in our response to this report, but this is for a number of reasons. First of all, because in a very real sense we have participated in the construction of this report. When the motion was originally passed by this organization to prepare the report, we were very excited about it. This was some two or three years ago. We thought that this was a very real area of concern for a Deans' organization. As such, we were happy to participate when invited. Dennis Shaw, the former President of NSA, was invited to participate as a member of Commission VIII, and he has kept us in touch with the developments of the Commission.

What we have attempted to do, of course, as the report itself suggests, we have been concerned with these questions since we were founded in 1947. At this particular point in time we have a proposal that we are working on, which has been submitted to a prominent foundation, and which is now being considered by that foundation as a sort of follow-up to this report.

I think the report also has to be taken in perspective in that it came to this organization and to the public at the same time when I think there is a serious examination of the question of student freedoms going on throughout the nation. And this is in part, I think, the result of the Berkeley situation, and it is also in part because in general the society is examining the question of freedom and student responsibility, and the ways in which institutions operate with respect to levels of maturity of students.

Specifically, our proposal involves the development of some thirty to forty seminars, and pilot projects on various campuses in the country, from as different groups as possible -- that is from as heterogeneous a group as possible, ranging from small liberal arts institutions to large public universities.

Those schools will be selected by a number of criteria that we have sort of developed, excluding both the least free and the most free, since we feel that it would be useless to try to do anything on those campuses, either because they had already achieved certain levels of freedom, or because they would be unwilling to participate fully in the program.

The program, in any event, in one form or another, will continue, whether we are able to receive foundation support or not, because we do have a continuing concern in education.

I would like to reiterate my statement that in the final analysis I believe that any improvement in the situation, as far as academic freedom is concerned, any evolution of greater levels of freedom involves the active cooperation, not only of the students, but of the administration. We, for one school, are unwilling to go on to a campus and to plan programs, and to actively attempt to expand levels of student freedom, unless the administration has indicated a willingness and an interest in these sorts of concerns.

We have never, to my knowledge, in the history of the Association ever attempted to organize a very definite or vigorous protest against any administration any place in this country. We have from time to time censured administrations, that is true. But what I am talking about is conducting a continuing campaign of protest and aggression, as it were, on campus. Thus, those of you, or any others

who may believe that we were responsible for the Berkeley demonstrations, are in error, and any other demonstration of that type which has occurred. We, in fact, attempted to do our little bit in mediating the Berkeley demonstration -- not too successfully, but I think that is both the reflection of our own inexperience and a reflection of the critical level which had been reached by the time that we were becoming involved.

At any rate, it is our hope that through discussion in what is essentially non-crisis oriented situations with administrators, when those administrators have voluntarily indicated interest in discussing and perhaps expanding levels of student freedom, that we can come to some sort of agreement and discussion which will be interesting and appropriate to all sided.

It is also true that in critical situations -- i.e., once the demonstrations or whatever particular type of protest is manifested, is occurring -- that there is really very little that can be done by any outside organization, and in a very real sense NSA is always considered an outside organization, although it really is not, because it is viewed with suspicion and so forth, and all of the other characteristics that a critical situation develops.

It is our hope that in taking the initiative, and with the full cooperation of Deans, Presidents, etc., that we will be able in non-critical situations to develop the channels of communication between all segments of the campus and the administration that are necessary to avoid critical situations in the future.

I have perhaps a naive nineteenth century liberal belief that in the final analysis people of good will can come to agreements on issues of mutual concern, through discussion and whatever you want to call it, evaluation, and perhaps to even use the nasty word "negotiation."

This is why NSA is taking this particular approach to the problem. Of course, I will elaborate a little bit by saying that at the same time NSA is not going to totally back down, permits commitment to certain models for academic freedom, and those models essentially correspond with the three percent of institutions to which Dean Williamson referred in his report. The question is not one of whether or not we are committed to those models. We are and we will be, barring changes by the Congress. The question is one rather of tactics, and of whether we are going to take an evolutionary, as opposed to revolutionary approach to the accomplishment and implementation of those models.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: How about ASG now? What is ASG's approach as a national organization on the local scene to the implementation of the seminar suggestion as an approach

to achieving the desires of freedom on the local campus?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, as far as a national organization is concerned we, of course, do not take a stand. I mean, the nature of organization that we are, we provide information. We would like to provide the information to the student governments on the Williamson report, and what it reveals, and encourage student government to discuss this on perhaps student to student, student to administrator, student to faculty levels.

We can encourage, of course, the betterment of relations, and hopefully our information will enable the student government to show a more mature approach and provide to the Deans an indication that they are ready to take a step into more student freedoms.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: How about that conservative Catholic crowd, on my left this morning?

MISS BYRNES: I am in the awkward position really of being a representative of the Catholic colleges which, as you well know if you have read the report, do not fare exactly well. I am up a tree really. I do not know what to do. (Laughter) I am not the one who is going to do it. (Laughter) And the people who are going to do it are not here.

I am concerned, very much concerned, because just as one of the problems of student governments that I mentioned is communication on a local level, it involves very much the stimulation and communication in a group such as this.

The most that we can do from a student angle, as far as I can see at the moment, is to implement this along with the evaluation of the Catholic college which we are continuing this year, which we have instituted and will continue. And we will use this report to the best of our advantage as a comparative point of view.

Therefore, the basic uses of the report for my organization would be dissemination, comparison, and as best we can to make the student government presidents realize, or to allow them to realize that not all situations are just exactly as theirs are, and that with methodical, ordered communication and participation with the people who can help to bring this, or change this climate, we will certainly get somewhere. But as you can see from the statistics, I think it is going to be a long, hard pull.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: There is a second special segment of the campus population represented here, the Association of Women Students. Sally, on a national level, and as a national organization, what are you going to do at Douglas

College, Women's Division of Rutgers University, to participate in the implementation of the recommendations of this report, in the development of a seminar approach to resolution?

Or, let's choose another campus that is co-educational, and a place that I am somewhat familiar with, Syracuse, where I am sure they have some affiliation. What are you going to do to see that this seminar mode or technique is used to achieve the desirable freedoms, as a national organization now?

MISS VASICKO: Well at Salt Lake City, Utah, a couple of weeks ago we held a national convention, and we had approximately 635 delegates from all over the United States. At that convention three universities, Brigham Young, the University of Alabama, and Ohio Wesleyan, volunteered to host a seminar this summer on campus leadership. I would hope that we could use this report in our analysis of a responsible campus leadership. It would be my desire that we could have copies printed up and sent to the participants in the summer seminar, and that they could discuss it, analyze it, and handle it in the way that their school would determine, to perhaps better understand the student movement that is going on now. This is what I would really like to do with it.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Jon, do you have anything that you would like to add to this? You have indicated that you are already free. You are interested in quality, if I remembered that right.

MR. MASTIN: Thank you. I am glad the message got through.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Well, it did up here. (Laughter)

MR. MASTIN: I hope it did out there too. Maybe I ought to make a remark or two.

First of all, my organization on the legislation and positions that we have taken, only one time have we taken a position in the area of social concerns or even in the area of student freedoms, and this was on the particular area of discrimination in colleges.

I think as for implementing a program in a seminar type on the local basis for us this report provides perhaps, within limits, a guideline to at least have some idea of what is going on nationally with the participation of students in administration. I think it is a very significant guideline for us, because a lot of evening student councils are not aware that they have a real role, a participating role in the administration. I think Dr. Kauffman brought

this out yesterday in his seminar that he held, that I attended.

I think that what will happen, first of all, is on a national level I am going to be able to focus more attention on student freedoms, and implementation of student freedoms and student participation. And I am not quite sure yet what will happen on the local level out of this thing. I hope that it will be evolution and not revolution, the same as Steve does.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Well, I have two or three, or four or five other questions. I am going to suggest those questions, and I would like to really give the audience an opportunity for involvement. I think that is the word. So I am just going to indicate some of the questions and some of the issues that seem to me are suggested both from what has been said here and what I have heard in pieces around the meeting so far.

One of the first things I learned when I moved to my new position a year ago, if you will forgive the commercial, was that the Rutgers college crowd each year, at the end of the year, took an inventory and decided what the word for the year had been. It seems to me that the word for this conference is "seminar," at least if you begin with the Williamson report.

It seems to me in terms of some of the discussions that have gone on, one of the additional words that have come out of the exchanges has been the word "commitment."

I am a little bit intrigued because I sat in on a discussion last night where there was a lot of discussion, and a lot of fervor in support of the commitment of students, and an awful lot of thin thinking regarding the commitment of Deans.

I am wondering, and one of the questions I was going to ask of this seminar group, is how they saw the commitment of Deans, because they seem reasonably sure of the commitment of students, the commitment to community, the commitment to both the new and tradition, commitment to education, and they have used these words.

I am curious what they would describe as their view of the commitment from the National Student Government point of view, the commitment of Deans.

I was pleased when Nano, in her initial comments, introduced a concept which it seems to me is almost a natural projection -- Bob Gordon and I were talking about this in the back of the room when we came in -- about this seminar approach. It is an extension which it seems to me raises serious questions about the future of student

government, because it seems to me if you begin with the mode, the word, the technique "seminar," and you extend that far enough, you end up without student government, and hopefully, with some reality, university government, or this community government concept, which he identified.

What does this do to national student government organizations, and does this mean that we have an affiliate membership that is large in number that includes students? And maybe ultimately in terms of the eligibility of affiliates to become presidents of this Association, in the throw-back to the discussion this morning, perhaps NASPA on a national level has a student as its president.

I have some other thoughts, but I do not want to get them into this equation at this point, unless you respond to them and pick them up from here to address them to the seminar, or unless you do not have any questions or issues that you wish on the table during the remaining fifteen minutes that we are going to formally be in session.

... Discussion ensued ...

SEMINAR

"Use and Misuse of Sedatives and Stimulating
Drugs -- A Burgeoning Problem for the
College Students?"

Tuesday - April 5, 1965

The seminar convened in the Alexandria Room at one-forty-five o'clock, John Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: There is one nice thing about being Chairman of a program. This is the first time I have been in the front of the room since I have been to the meetings. (Laughter)

I would like to refer to a few statements in opening our discussion today. The first, from a recent article in the Readers' Digest:

"On the Sunday before Christmas, 1959, a deluxe Greyhound bus, crowded with holiday travelers, was rolling along U.S. Route 80 from Los Angeles to New Orleans. Suddenly about ten miles east of Tucson, Arizona, the driver was horrified to see a double decker cattle truck coming toward him in the same lane.

"A bus passenger who also saw the truck, said

later, 'In that split second I knew we were going to crash. I tried to yell but no sounds came.' The crash hurled cattle into the bus. Two people behind it piled into the wreckage. Nine people were killed, thirty-four seriously injured, thirty head of cattle destroyed, and O. D. Gould, the bus company's claims director called it the worst accident in Western Greyhound's history.

"Why was the truck traveling in the wrong lane? The coroner's report on the dead truck driver supplied the answer. At the time of the accident the driver was riding high on amphetamine sulfate pills, a stimulant that holds you up mentally and then turns you loose suddenly like a balloon."

Mr. Larrick, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs in a recent statement indicated on July 19, 1963, "An automobile carrying an Air Force Sergeant, his wife, his six year old son, and eight year old daughter approached the check point established by a highway commission traffic survey near Tipton, Iowa. The automobile pulled to a stop behind a truck. A few moments later a tractor-trailer crashed into the rear of the automobile and drove it under the truck in front where it burst into flames. All members of the family in the automobile were mangled and charred beyond recognition.

"The driver of the tractor-trailer was not injured. Three bottles of amphetamine drugs were found in his suitcase in the cab of the truck. Although he initially denied knowledge of their source and denied they were his, he later admitted purchasing and using the drugs during the trip. Tests proved he was under the influence of the amphetamine at the time of the accident."

In the Chicago Tribune, "Narcotic trafficking among teenagers, long a nationwide problem, is getting out of hand in the Chicago area.

"Teenagers from all social and economic levels, but predominantly Caucasians, are using bennies and Christmas trees for kicks. Lt. Cornelius Casey, Commander of the Narcotics section said amphetamine sulfate pills, bennies, and brightly colored barbiturate capsules -- Christmas trees -- are sold by and to teenagers for ten to twenty-five cents per pill."

A recent News Week magazine article: A tall boy from the suburbs, a little flabby, a little over eager to please, sits on a bar stool toying with a beer he does not want. What he does want is benzedrine. "The best guys in school are on bennies," he says. "I was at a party last night and two linemen from the football team were there and we got along fine. I used to have trouble with my human relations, I really did. But now Old Bennie takes care of all that. He gets my parents off my back too. They're always

on me, study, study, study. You have got to get into Princeton. Hell, I will be lucky to make Podunk with my grades. But whenever it gets too rough at home, I just go off with my buddies and we pop a few bennies and everything is just great. Old Bennie teaches me more about life than a dozen Princetons. He's my dehydrated diploma."

The addict is in the schools, disrupting them, lowering standards. He is on the streets, visible as never before, mugging, burglary, sometimes even killing to pay for his drugs.

Recently in Commission II we started getting inquiries about the use of drugs and how they were being used in college, and wanting to know whether or not there was any possibility of getting information on this. To see whether or not the interest was widespread, I made a pilot survey, and the interesting thing about it was that particularly in the small liberal arts college there did not really seem to be a serious problem.

But every Dean that was contacted wanted to get as much information as he could and asked the Commission to please go ahead on this.

With this information, then, I happened to attend a state medical society meeting in Wisconsin, and I met a Dr. Zadask who referred me to Dr. Weinstein who is here today. I wrote to Dr. Weinstein indicating our desire, our questions that we had, and asked whether or not there would be anything that he, through his office, might be able to do for us.

I am flabbergasted at the response that we have gotten. I think this is perhaps indicative of the seriousness of the problem, but also perhaps indicative of the fact that I had indicated to Dr. Weinstein that we were having a meeting of influential educators from all over the country and probably this was one of the best opportunities, for at least another year, that they would have to talk to men who were in leading positions and in positions where they were most responsible for things of this sort.

I am going to ask Dr. Weinstein, if he will, to introduce the speakers. He is familiar with them, with their responsibilities, and I would at this time like to introduce Dr. Weinstein, the Director of the Division of Medical Review of the Food and Drug Administration. Dr. Weinstein.
(Applause)

DR. HOWARD I. WEINSTEIN (Director, Division of Medical Review, Food and Drug Administration): Dean Gwin, Ladies and Gentlemen: When Dean Gwin first contacted me about preparing a little talk on this subject, use and abuse of drugs on the campus, we thought the matter over and

decided that instead of a lecture, to last an hour or an hour and a half, where everybody would be bored and probably need some amphetamines to keep awake (laughter), we would make it into a panel discussion and limit the presentation to 30 or 40 minutes, and the rest of the time, 40 or 45 minutes, throw it open to questions and answers.

With that in view, we chose a panel from the personnel of the Food and Drug Administration, who are in key positions in their various fields and will tell you their interest in this topic and what they are prepared to do to help you and your students.

On my left is Mr. Douglas Hansen, who is a Deputy Director of the Division of Field Operations of the Food and Drug Administration. His job is to oversee the activities of the field offices and there are 18 or 19 field offices all over the country, which are the local Food and Drug offices, so to speak, under the control of Washington, but these are the places with which you will be dealing if you have to deal with them at all.

He will tell you the problems and how they handle them, and exactly what to do about them, and will tell you some interesting case histories that he has.

On my right is Dr. Norman Alberstadt, who is in my division and who is quite knowledgeable in the field of pharmacology, especially as relates to stimulant and sedative drugs. He will present the main paper on the use and abuse of these drugs and will detail the pharmacology, the physiological events that happen after ingestion of these drugs, and also the pathological features involved.

To his right is Mr. Morris Yakowitz, who is the Director of the Division of Case Supervision. Under his purview comes directly the enforcement of the law as far as the individual cases are concerned. He and his staff work up the cases for presentation to the court. Of course, the attorneys try the cases, but his division is the one that whips the cases into shape for presentation.

Last, but not least, on the far right, is Mr. Alvin Gottlieb, who is the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, assigned to the Food and Drug Administration. It is his job, together with the district attorneys on the local level in the cities where these cases are being tried, to see the case through to a successful conclusion, successful from the point of view of the Food and Drug Administration, and that is the public in general.

The problem of amphetamines and barbiturates, the one being a stimulant and the other being a sedative, is great at present and is increasing, especially in the larger cities, the larger universities in these cities.

Up until recently the illegal use of these drugs and the illegal obtaining of these drugs presented a problem to the users. But if the habituation or the addiction is great enough they will go to any lengths to obtain the drug. I might, in passing, state that in the past two months, for example, we have issued regulations placing certain amphetamine inhalers on prescription that were formerly over the counter. You may remember some years ago the benzedrine inhalers were voluntarily withdrawn by Smith, Kline and French laboratories from over the counter sale, and a different kind was substituted, the benzedrettes.

However, there remained others, and it was not until relatively recently that we had enough evidence to show that these were being misused to a great extent, and the misuse consists of the following:

These inhalers contain paper inside which is soaked in the amphetamine. When used as directed, as a nasal inhalant, they are perfectly safe and effective for the purposes they are sold for. But the addict goes a step further. He breaks open the inhaler, soaks out the amphetamine from the paper, and is able to get from 150 to 250 mg. of benzedrine or amphetamine from these papers, which is the equivalent of 20 to 50 single 5 mg. tablets that Dean Gwin mentioned, at a quarter apiece. You can see the savings to him.

Secondly, they were easy to obtain. And depending on the state of his addiction, he will either inject that into a vein, a mainliner, as it is called, or drink it. In either event, quite a jolt is obtained from this.

Recently we have put those on a prescription basis. It will make it a little more difficult for them to obtain, but I am sure the ones who obtain the tablets illegally will obtain these in the same manner.

At this point I would like to introduce the first speaker, who will present his paper on the use and abuse of sedative and stimulating drugs, Dr. Norman Alberstadt.

DR. NORMAN ALBERSTADT (Medical Officer, Division of Medical Review, Food and Drug Administration): The illegal use of drugs has been a cause of concern to the medical profession and law enforcement personnel for many years. Drugs that are used for their effect upon the psyche create the greatest hazard. The pattern of usage varies from occasional indulgence in moderate dosage to a daily compulsive use of these drugs in excessive quantities. While the person who uses sedatives or stimulants compulsively is obviously the most important social and medical problem, the subject who uses them occasionally is also deserving of attention since he may at some later date fall into a more serious dependence on drugs. The medical scientific literature has nothing to say about the use of drugs by college students per se. I

can only guess as to the extent of the problem there. The undergraduate student does not figure in the case histories of amphetamine habituation appearing in scientific journals, for example. I did notice, in the process of preparing this talk, that the subjects of these case histories included a graduate student and a nurse recently graduated from her training program.

One might venture to guess that a careful epidemiological study of drug use in our institutions of learning would reveal that the problem exists mostly in students who are burdened with excessive or growing amounts of responsibility and stress. I would guess that the undergraduate student is likely to use stimulants probably about the time of final examinations. While this kind of usage may be a forewarning of a more serious problem that lies ahead for these individuals, it does not present an immediate problem to the user, nor to those who are responsible for his welfare, since, as we shall see in the discussion that follows, there is no scientific evidence indicating that this type of usage is seriously harmful to the subject's health or level of performance if it is not carried to an extreme.

On the other hand, the use of sedatives or stimulants to augment the pleasure-producing effects of alcohol, such as might occur at an unsupervised social gathering, could lead to automobile accidents, or impulsive sexual assaults. Incidents such as these are not documented in the scientific literature, and one must depend largely upon rumor and lay reporting to gain some insight into this aspect of the drug problem.

Personality problems are believed to underlie all cases of drug misuse. A frequent victim is the psychopathic personality, the subject who gives a history of repeated criminal and antisocial acts. These individuals are not attuned to delaying gratification, and are not likely to find their way to an academic life where a number of years are devoted to mere preparation for the main tasks of living. The compulsive and the passive-dependent neurotics are also candidates for drug abuse. These individuals are just as likely to be a portion of the academic population as of the rest of the population, and whatever drug problem exists on the campus, either at the college or graduate level, is likely to be found among neurotics.

Such conjectures as I have made, while they may be temporarily useful, are a poor substitute for a well-conducted scientific survey. At some future time, such data may be made available to us. In the discussion that follows, I will describe the signs and symptoms that can accompany the misuse of barbiturates and amphetamines. The group of drugs called "amphetamines" includes amphetamine itself, methamphetamine, or desoxyephedrine and phenmetrazine. The "barbiturates" include such drugs as phenobarbital, pentobarbital, secobarbital, and amobarbital.

You will notice that I refer to chronic barbiturate use as addiction, but to chronic amphetamine use as habituation. The term addiction is reserved for drugs that, along with other criteria, produce serious physical dependence manifested by striking physical signs and symptoms when the drug is suddenly withheld from the addict. Amphetamines produce all the critical phenomena of addiction except physical dependence, e.g., pleasing effects on psychic experience, craving (psychic dependence), a tendency to increase the dose with continued use (drug tolerance), the perpetration of antisocial acts in order to obtain the drug, and eventual impairment of the well-being of the user and his ability to get along in society.

A variety of drugs have been used for their pleasing effect on the nervous system. Amphetamines and barbiturates enjoy great popularity because they are relatively inexpensive and easy to obtain through illegal channels. They are produced in great quantities and it is estimated that about 50 percent of the amount produced is distributed illegally. Enough amphetamine is produced in the United States to provide each man, woman, and child with three unit doses of 5 mg. each month. Allowing for the fact that a portion of the quantity produced is exported, we can estimate that in other industrialized countries, the drug is used in similar amounts. It has been found, for example, that in the city of Newcastle upon Tyne, the per capita consumption of amphetamine is equivalent to one 5 mg. tablet per month.

Amphetamines are prescribed by physicians chiefly to reduce appetite in obese patients, and for the amelioration of minor cases of mental depression. They have been restricted by government regulation to prescription use because of the hazards that attend their use. In doses of 20 mg. or more, amphetamine usually causes a rise in blood pressure. It can also cause abnormalities of heart rhythm and can precipitate attacks of angine pectoris in certain individuals. It should not be used by persons with advanced arteriosclerosis, over-active thyroid, or nervousness.

Some individuals are unusually sensitive to the drug, and develop symptoms of overdosage after taking a normal dose. Chronic use by habituated individuals often produces weight loss. The effect of the drug in normal doses on the nervous system is influenced by the personality and mental state of the user. Generally, a normal dose produces wakefulness, alertness, increased initiative, elevation of mood, talkativeness, and increased motor activity. These are the symptoms that would appear in any one of us if we took a normal dose as prescribed by a doctor.

It has been found that mood elevation is more likely to occur when a number of people who are taking the drug are grouped together. There are many studies in the scientific literature demonstrating the effect of amphetamine on psychomotor performance.

Using normal doses of the drugs on individuals who do not use them habitually, it has been found that amphetamine has its most striking action in mitigating the effects of fatigue on psychomotor performance. The studies demonstrating this effect extended over a period of two or three days. They give us no assurance that amphetamines taken daily for one or two weeks of hard work and a minimal amount of sleep would be equally effective in avoiding fatigue, or that they are not harmful to bodily health when used in this way. When non-fatigued subjects are studied, psychomotor performance is not raised strikingly above normal. There are few published studies of the effect of the drug on judgment; the studies that have been done in this area show no evidence that recklessness is induced in normal subjects under the conditions of the experiments. It should be noted, however, that the studies of judgment have been made exclusively on non-habituated subjects, using normal doses of amphetamine. On the other hand, in contrast to the experimental conditions, illegal distribution of the drug leads to chronic and sustained use by habituated persons, usually in doses far above those that are prescribed by physicians.

Amphetamine habituation is widespread. Its incidence in the Japanese city of Kurume was estimated in 1950 to be 1% of the whole population and 5% of the 16 to 25 year-old age group. Habituation in Newcastle upon Tyne has an incidence of 0.2%. Personality problems are thought to underlie all cases of habituation. The males tend to be psychopathic (showing chronic antisocial behavior) whereas the women tend to be depressed, neurotic, and lacking in confidence. Teenagers explain their use of the drug in its ability to help them to compete in their social milieu. In Japan it was used by students who desired to be more effective in study or in sports, and by night workers for the purpose of overcoming sleepiness.

Tolerance to the stimulatory action of amphetamine develops with chronic, sustained use. Probably this is the reason why the victim of amphetamine habituation typically increases the dose of the drug with continued use. In contrast to the usual prescribed dose of 5 to 15 mg. three times a day, the habituated user takes 100 to 250 mg. once or twice daily. That is about five to ten times the normal dosage. His inability to exercise adequate caution in regulating the dose is evidenced by the appearance of drug toxicity in some subjects who have had experience taking the drug for several years.

Drug toxicity is especially likely to occur soon after an increase in daily dosage has been made. The symptoms of drug toxicity to a great extent are exaggerations of the usual effects of the drug on the nervous system. They consist of restlessness, tremor, insomnia, confusion, assaultiveness, altered libido, and panic. Toxicity culminates in the amphetamine psychosis which is attended by auditory and

visual hallucinations and paranoid delusions (ideas of persecution), in addition to the symptoms listed above. Attending the psychotic symptoms, there may be convulsions, marked elevation or depression of blood pressure, coma, and shock, sometimes ending in death. Symptoms of psychosis clear rapidly upon withdrawal of the drug. Abrupt withdrawal of the drug from the habituated person may produce mental depression, weakness, and gastrointestinal upset, usually of a mild degree. A period of altered nocturnal sleep pattern (deepened) lasting for 3 to 8 weeks has been observed following withdrawal.

Turning now to the barbiturates, several million doses of barbiturates are used daily in the United States; enough is produced to provide for a per capita consumption of two doses per month.

Barbiturates have a depressant effect on the central nervous system. Most drugs in this class are prescribed in doses of 100 to 200 mg. to induce sleep, and in smaller doses given four times a day for a calming effect. Because of the hazards attending the use of barbiturates, they are restricted to prescription use only. The response to these drugs is influenced by the pre-existent level of excitement of the patient. The barbiturates depress all parts of the central nervous system. Some of these drugs are inactivated by the liver, while others are disposed of by the kidneys, so that individuals with sufficient disease of these organs may experience an exaggerated effect from a normal dose of medication.

People allergic to barbiturates may react to them with a rash and a febrile illness that can cause serious damage to the liver and other internal organs. This group of drugs is involved in 5% of the suicides occurring in this country, causing 1,500 deaths a year in this manner. Taken in excess, they produce severe depression of the central nervous system, culminating in coma, shock, and death. In normal dosage, an occasional person reacts paradoxically with excitement rather than sedation.

A frequently encountered side effect of the longer-acting barbiturates, such as phenobarbital, is "hangover," consisting of lassitude, dizziness, and gastrointestinal symptoms, occurring on the morning after the drug has been taken to induce sleep. Even when there is no "hangover," such as with the short-acting barbiturates (secobarbital, amobarbital, pentobarbital) there is impairment of psychomotor performance for several hours after awakening; thus there is a hazard in using barbiturates to induce sleep if the subject is going to engage in activities which require complete alertness on the following morning. When taken in small doses for daytime sedation, the barbiturates alleviate feelings of anxiety, and in normal subjects produce little if any change in psychomotor performance. With larger doses,

such as are used to induce sleep, a significant impairment of over-all psychomotor functioning is produced consistently. Most of these drugs do not require increments in dosage when they are used repeatedly in treating insomnia.

Addiction to barbiturates usually involves the use of the shorter-acting drugs. The subject may seek oblivion and release from the present situation, rather than elation. These drugs are often used to reinforce the effects of alcohol. A personality disorder underlies addiction. Psychoneurotic persons, especially of the passive-dependent type, usually are introduced to the drug by their doctor whereas the psychopathic type of addict is initially exposed to these drugs by his friends. In contrast to the normal user, the addict develops tolerance to barbiturates. The average dose of the addict is about 1,500 mg. per day, roughly 10 times the dose ordinarily prescribed by a doctor. Acute barbiturate poisoning can occur at any time during the addict's history, especially when the dose has been increased recently. Because of tolerance to the drugs, the addict may show no outward signs of their affliction even though he is taking large doses. Eventually, however, he develops sluggishness, incoordination, awkward gait, untidiness, and tremor. Mental signs such as confusion, loss of emotional control and generalized intellectual impairment are likely to develop. Hostile and suicidal tendencies may appear. The addict frequently is misdiagnosed as suffering from alcoholism or organic disease of the central nervous system.

Visible changes in the tissue of the central nervous system have not been observed in man, but changes have been produced in animals by exposing them to high doses for prolonged periods. In contrast to what occurs with amphetamines, abrupt withdrawal of barbiturates from the addict produces serious disorder. Typical of the withdrawal period are insomnia, fainting, tremor, and rapid loss of weight. Epileptic seizures may occur. A temporary psychosis often develops with vivid visual hallucinations, excitement, and ideas of persecution.

The signs and symptoms which I have enumerated for the most part appear late in the history of drug misuse. The diagnosis is not easily made even at this stage because the same phenomena can be produced by a variety of organic disorders, including, for example, epilepsy, brain tumor, and encephalitis. Aberrations of behavior occurring in the classroom or on the campus can justify suspicion only and not a definitive diagnosis. Whenever suspicion is aroused, the student should be called to the student health clinic for interview and examination. Even then, without the student's cooperation in the form of a confession of drug misuse, the diagnosis can only be tentative in almost all cases.

The diagnosis would be aided if legal means is obtained to search the student's dormitory room, since the

individual with a problem of drug misuse is likely to have a reserve supply of the drug readily available. This supply can be in the form of tablets, capsules, liquid, or nasal inhalers. A pharmacist's label may or may not be on the container, depending on whether the subject has been able to obtain illegal refills of a prescription or has obtained the drug from some source other than a pharmacy.

New drugs are being introduced constantly. Some of these show promise of being habituating or addicting, and they are dangerous to use without a doctor's supervision. They are classified as sedatives or tranquilizers and as psychic energizers. One of them, meprobamate, figures prominently in the illegal distribution of drugs, and some of the others may become equally popular in the future. It will suit our purposes, today, merely to call your attention to these drugs. Their effects on the user are similar in many ways to the effects of amphetamines and barbiturates, and their unsupervised use on the campus is worthy of a full measure of regard.

In conclusion, the efforts of the college administrator in dealing with the problem of drug abuse on the campus should be directed toward (1) encouraging scientific investigation of the problem as it exists at school, (2) directing suspected victims to qualified medical personnel for diagnosis and treatment, (3) enlargement of counseling services to students and encouraging troubled students to avail themselves of these facilities, and (4) cooperation with law enforcement agencies in uncovering the illegal source from which the drugs are obtained. (Applause)

DR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you, Dr. Alberstadt.

The next speaker on the program will give you a short presentation of the administrative problems involved in the drug abuse in amphetamines and barbiturates. Mr. Douglas Hansen, Assistant Director of the Division of Field Operations.

MR. DOUGLAS HANSEN (Assistant Director, Division of Field Operations, Food and Drug Administration): Thank you, Dr. Weinstein. Dean Gwin, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure to be here with you to talk to you about some of the problems that might exist on your campus, and how we think we might be able to help you in solving some of your problems.

First of all, I would like to tell you that I am with the Division of Field Operations, and our main concern is the investigation to determine whether or not a violation exists, to determine if drugs are being distributed in illegal channels. To talk a little more about the problem, I would first like to give you a little background so you will see some of the factors behind this terrible racket.

Taking the amphetamine tablet, which is one of the big headaches in this work, we find that one manufacturer, whose product appears time and again in the illicit trade, pays approximately 17 cents for raw materials for a bottle of a thousand 5 mg. amphetamine tablets. By the time he has the tablets bottled, sealed and labeled, he has an investment of 50 cents. This is for a bottle of 1,000 tablets. Then his price for the legitimate wholesaler in legal drug channels ranges from 75 cents to a dollar and a half per bottle. The variation in price depends on the quantity he sells at one time.

However, when the drug becomes diverted to illegal wholesalers the price jumps to \$20.00 to \$25.00 for a bottle of 1,000 tablets. These in turn are peddled on the street and elsewhere at a price of from ten cents to one dollar per tablet.

So you have a potential retail price of \$1,000 for a bottle of 1,000 tablets that cost the manufacturer, all costs included, 50-cents. A tremendous opportunity for illegal profit.

We find that when the amphetamines are smuggled into jails and prisons, the price is even higher, as much as \$1.50 or more per tablet.

The estimated production of amphetamines and barbiturates is around nine to nine and a half million tablets or capsules annually. Approximately half of these go into the illicit traffic. Obviously it is a multi-million dollar racket.

To give you an example of two recent cases terminated in cooperation with state authorities, in one instance nine million tablets were seized in possession of an illicit wholesaler. In another case that took place within the last several weeks one and a half million tablets were seized.

To tell you some of the abuses, going back to the Bobby Greenley's murder-kidnapping, Carl Hall, the murderer, was under the influence of amphetamines. The truck driver cases have been mentioned. Time and again we run into serious truck accidents where the driver is under the influence of amphetamines, and there have been serious crashes and lives lost. Many drivers interviewed -- those who are alive -- have talked about hallucinations, visions, about knights coming down the highway on a white horse, and things like that.

To give you one example, one truck driver saw a sail boat on the highway, and turned off to avoid hitting it. It was a mirage. He landed in a field and was not hurt. Later on he saw a cruiser ahead of him and he thought this was another mirage, and plowed right into it. It was a

Chris-Craft cruiser being hauled to the beach resort.

I have a few pictures to show you. I will briefly describe them. If you are interested you can look at them later. They are typical truck driver cases.

Here is one, a serious accident. A truck ran into a postal van. The truck is completely on the wrong side of the highway. The driver was under the influence of amphetamines.

Here we have a case of two truck drivers, a truck driver and a Colorado State Patrolman were crushed to death. There were four deaths. Two drivers and two patrolmen, when a state patrol car had parked behind a stopped truck off the highway and another truck came along and plowed into them. The truck driver in the moving vehicle was under the influence of amphetamine.

Here we have a picture of a truck driver trapped in his cab after hitting a freight car. He died two hours later. He had been taking 10 to 165 mg. amphetamine tablets just prior to the accident.

Here is a horror picture, the two dead Colorado State Highway Patrolmen. These are just a few examples, but it shows you the seriousness and the potential danger of anybody mis-using these drugs.

Then we have abnormal behavior in individuals. We have sex parties, you have murders, many murders committed while people are under the influence of these drugs. You have sprees where crimes are committed. In recent months there have been two separate cases where teenagers have gone on crime sprees -- no previous record to speak of with the police department, but under the influence of amphetamines they have needlessly murdered people. One case involved two cousins, 18 and 19 year old boys, who went on a spree and murdered two small boys for nothing but kicks. Both of the murders were under the influence of amphetamine. Then we had another case where two teenagers wanted to get cops. They murdered two policemen under the influence of amphetamines.

I have some pictures here I think you can see a little better than the previous ones. It will show you the change in an individual when on amphetamines. These were taken by the Los Angeles Police Department. Here is the normal appearance of this particular person. Actually he is a young man close to 30 years old. Here is a picture taken about four months later after he had gone on the amphetamines. You begin to notice a change. Here is a picture taken a month later, and here is one two months later, and then here is one four months later, and you can notice the change of the features of the face, the hollowed

cheeks, the wild look in the eyes. This is typical of an individual who has been on amphetamines for some time. If you are interested you might take a look at these later.

How does this fit in with the colleges?

Our records show considerable misuse by young people, including both high school and college students. We have a constant problem in various areas, for instance the beach surfers, or as some people refer to them, the beach bums. I understand there are two classes, the true surfer and the beach bum type. Nevertheless, we have these beach bums and their followers at the beach resort, during spring vacation when the college kids and others head to the beaches, at Ocean City, for example. The local police have had trouble year after year with riots during these spring vacation episodes and have picked up young amphetamine or bennie pushers on the beach selling them loosely.

An interesting and recent development is your ski bums, and we find many of them are the same surfers. We have records of them in California beaches in the summer time and they head into the ski resorts in the winter time. Again we find bennies being peddled at the bars, and you find during vacationing time many college students in town and some of them at these parties.

Quite often we find bennies being peddled at bowling alleys, private parties, drive-ins and amusement centers. We find increasing numbers of college and high school students involved in these cases.

I might point out that it has been our opinion that in the past there has been a fear by many of the colleges of adverse publicity, and it might be that they were aware of some of these problems on campus but did not wish to bring any of this adverse publicity to them. Recently one college president was quoted as saying that they have had some of these cases and they swept them under the rug, but the rug is getting kind of lumpy now. We suspect this is true in a good many cases.

We as an enforcement agency agree with the philosophy that the problem cannot be solved either by silence or sensationalism. We believe that there should be close cooperation between the university officials and the enforcement agencies to help solve this problem.

Our main concern is not to bring publicity to a school or legal action against the user student, but rather to get to the source, to uncover the pushers and to find the original diversion from legal channels.

I am going to give you some typical examples of cases where college students have been involved, and you

will note that in no instance do we take action against the student.

I do not want to mislead you. If we found a student on a campus that was part of this diversion and was actively pushing the tablets, the chances are serious consideration would be given to prosecution. But our normal action is to get to the illegal diversion, not to seek action against a student. So your fears can be allayed as to bringing adverse publicity against the student as far as prosecution is concerned. Under the present law it is our practice to merely try to get to the illegal source of the drug.

Let me give you a few typical examples of recent cases where college students were involved, and tell you how they came to our attention.

One very serious situation arose when a director of health at a college brought to our attention the fact that one of the girl students had passed out during her physical ed class. She was taken to the health center for examination, which is certainly the approved technique in this type of situation, and when the doctors could not find anything organically wrong they questioned her about use or misuse of drugs. She denied taking any drugs. But one of her girl friends was with her, and after this girl left the girl friend went to the doctor and said this was not true, that the girl had been taking drugs, in fact, a number of her friends were taking them.

So the director of health brought this to our attention and we made an investigation. We found that the girls were actually getting amphetamine tablets through the mail from a doctor. The doctor had never seen them and they were able to purchase as many tablets as they wanted as often as they wanted, and were passing them around to their girl friends. One girl friend admitted she had goofed a test while under the influence.

Investigation of this particular doctor showed that he had sold 600,000 amphetamines in one year's time to approximately a thousand customers, most of these were college students at a number of colleges in the area. One of the students, we found, had had to drop out of school and had been hospitalized. She really had the habit.

The doctor was found guilty in federal court, fined \$1500 and given two years probation. No charges were made against any of the students.

We had a recent case where a father reported that he had a brilliant son who was going to college on a scholarship and had been doing well previous years, and all of a sudden his behavior changed, his grades fell off and he was finally dropped from school because of grades. The father

found out that the boy was taking drugs and asked our investigation. We found out that this particular student was able to obtain amphetamine powder from a chemical supply house. In one of his laboratories he had seen this catalog and in his own name ordered some amphetamine powder. He started mainlining it -- shooting it in the vein -- as Dr. Weinstein pointed out earlier. Several of the other students were also involved. We have this investigation under way and have sufficient evidence now, we think, to bring a case.

Very recently at another college a female student told her lab assistant of a wild off-campus party she attended. They were all taking bennies during these parties. The lab assistant reported this to his professor who notified the Food and Drug Administration. We sent men in to make an investigation and we found that there was an active campus pusher. One of the students was really coining the dough, peddling these bennies to his fellow students. Also we traced his source to a medical practitioner. We have sufficient evidence now to prosecute in this particular case.

As a matter of interest, I would like to point out that if and when you do bring instances of misuse of drugs on the campus to our attention, our normal course of action is to have one of our field investigators call upon the responsible official at the university, whoever has reported the case, and discuss with you the facts that you have in hand, and even go to the extent of discussing a proposed course of action. There are many ways to do this. It might be temporarily enrolling a student in school or something of this nature. But we work very closely with the authorities, recognizing that you have a great interest in protecting your own students, and that you normally do not want the investigators coming on the campus and willy nilly contacting students. So we work very closely with the university officials in these cases.

I have with me some restricted drug posters that we use for cooperating law enforcement agencies, and I have sufficient copies that each and every one of you can take a copy if you would like. It shows you some of the more commonly found barbiturates and amphetamines, pictures in color. It tells a little about the law; it tells a little about the drugs themselves, and what to do if you find somebody is misusing the drug. There is a supply of these. I would be happy to have you help yourselves.

We do ask your cooperation in bringing to our attention promptly any actual cases of misuse that you might find. We will cooperate fully with you, taking action to protect both the interests of the school and the students. Thank you very much. (Applause)

DR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Hansen.

Our final speaker -- and this will be a short one, he assures me -- is the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for Food and Drug matters. Mr. Alvin Gottlieb.

MR. ALVIN GOTTLIEB (General Counsel, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Food and Drug Administration): Thank you. I have only a few short remarks, just to let you know that there is a federal law which makes it a crime to dispense dangerous drugs without an appropriate prescription of a physician.

Now "dispense" is a word of art. It merely means distribute, for money or for free. Anyone who distributes dangerous drugs without a prescription, on first offense if convicted may be sentenced to one year in jail for each such transaction, and/or \$1,000 fine. For second offenses, that is, those which have been terminated after the first conviction has been concluded, the penalty increases to three years per transaction, and/or \$10,000 fine per transaction.

Now let me point out that anyone dispensing in this manner is liable to these penalties, and by "anyone," I mean druggists, students, professors, diner operators, gas station pumper, and doctors.

We have found in some instances physicians are the source of these illegal drugs. The courts have held that when a physician dispenses drugs, sells drugs to a customer without the presence of a bona fide physician-patient relationship, he is dispensing the drugs without a prescription and is violating the law. A bona fide physician-patient relationship includes the usual medical examination, medical history, and the prescription or administration of drugs to cope with the health problems of the patient, not to sell it to him to pander to his needs or desire for kicks.

We found one doctor who was selling in such large quantities that he could not take the time to count the pills, and he weighed them out on a baby scale. (Laughter) Five pounds for so much, and eight pounds for some other price.

Cases of this sort are prosecuted by the local United States attorney in the area in which the problem occurs, on the recommendation of our department. We make the investigation and we make the recommendation to the appropriate United States attorney to bring the charge. The case is tried in a United States District Court before a United States District Judge, and a jury, unless it is waived. We participate in trying those cases from a legal standpoint.

Let me tell you about the practical operation of the witness problem in getting the case into court. For several reasons we prefer to utilize our own investigators in making the actual case. In line with Mr. Hansen has told

you, what we want from you people is information indicating that a problem exists. If we can find out who is selling the drugs, we will get somebody in there to find out whether it is really happening or not.

We do this for several reasons. One is we can never be certain of the truth of the information which is being sent forward with respect to any particular source, that "X" is selling drugs on the campus. The information that "X" is selling drugs may be due to a grudge or other unhappiness between the person providing the information and the person he is fingering.

Also, we prefer to have our own witnesses present the case in court to keep from having any possible pressures being brought against the students, professors, or whatever, who may be valuable witnesses in the court room, pressures which might convince them not to testify at one point or other. For many reasons. What we need is contact with the recipient or the seller, and that is what Mr. Hansen has asked from you.

Another thing that we need is some kind of complaint, if you will. Really not a complaint, but merely information from you indicating that the problem exists. There is a legal reason for that, among other things, apart from bringing it to our attention. One of the legal reasons is the legal concept of entrapment in criminal cases. This is a simple one. It merely means that government agents may not manufacture crime, they may not plant in the head of an otherwise innocent person the idea to do something which turns out to be a criminal violation of law. In other words, it is to prevent what is popularly known as a frame-up.

We can come in and investigate if we have reasonable grounds that the law may be violated. If that is the case we may come in and start an active investigation, which I am assured will occur if you provide the information to us.

Now let me moralize for a moment. We understand that this problem is greater than we think it is. And it is probably greater than you think it is, maybe even on your own campuses. I think that you have a responsibility, and your staff does, and your professors do, to take cognizance of this problem, to be alert, to maintain communication with the professors who deal directly with the students, and the students themselves to determine whether there is a problem. You have the duty to society, you have a duty to the students themselves who really do not know what they are getting into.

I may say that there is evidence that young people progress from the use of amphetamines and barbiturates to much more serious things, such as the hard narcotics, so-called, and you owe it to us to help our people in their job of trying to stamp this thing out.

The witnesses in the case generally, in all cases so far, have not been any of the students, have not been any of the professors or anybody else. We take it over after we find out the problem exists, and make our own independent cases. We actually purchase the material from the sellers in the area and use those cases to present in court.

Do not be fogged off also by the fact that there may be druggists' labels on bottles. Very often they use different bottles and pour the amphetamines in them. Also they may be getting them without prescription from pharmacists who actually put labels on them. The difficult part is finding out they are being used. But I think there is enough grapevine around universities so that you can find out almost anything that is going on. If you do, if you will get in touch with the local Food and Drug Administration office, please do. If you do not know where it is, you will probably find it in the telephone book under the United States Department of Health and Welfare. I believe the poster has that information on it. (Applause)

MR. HANSEN: This has the Washington office. They can get the local, and we get it at the district office.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Time is growing short. I understand that this session should be over around three o'clock, so we have about twenty minutes. This ends our formal presentation and we would be glad to entertain any questions from the floor, if I can possibly answer.

DEAN RANDALL W. HOFFMANN (Dean of Students, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York): Could you give us any information with regard to the legal implications of the distribution and the use of LSD and other hallucinogens, including marijuana, too?

DR. WEINSTEIN: Mr. Hansen, do you want to answer that?

MR. HANSEN: It is a legal problem. Al can tell you that the use of LSD is illegal.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Marijuana is the province of the narcotics people, the Treasury Department. LSD, like this material, it is illegal to dispense or distribute without a prescription. The same principles apply with respect to LSD as to the drugs that we have been discussing here.

DR. WEINSTEIN: I might add just one thing. LSD is a different situation. The drug is only used at present for investigational purposes, for bona fide medical investigational purposes, and even on prescription it is not available from the drug store. It is only available for investigational use. This is for bona fide investigational use. So it is not only illegal to sell it without a prescription,

it is illegal to sell it with a prescription.

DEAN JAMES W. LYONS (Dean of Students, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania): How about peyote?

DR. WEINSTEIN: I will answer that. Peyote, the Indian buttons, are only legal for the Indians. (Laughter) Since it is part of their religious ritual and since the constitution forbids anything that interferes with somebody's religion, and since the Indians seem to be diminishing anyhow, we allow peyote buttons to be used in Indian rituals, but not otherwise. Unless you are an Indian, you violate the law.

DEAN SHELTON L. BEATTY (Pomona College, Claremont, California): May I ask one of the doctors, or will a doctor speak on the relative risks of marijuana. We are told in some of the medical bulletins that this drug is not as serious a threat as some of the things that have been discussed here. I am not trying to advocate the use of marijuana, but I want more information, if I may, please.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Dr. Alberstadt, do you know anything about marijuana?

DR. ALBERSTADT: Well, we do not think of it as being as much of a problem as amphetamines and barbiturates. They are not trafficked in as heavily. They are considered to be dangerous drugs because of the effect they have upon the users mentally, but they are not habituating as far as I know and certainly not addicting, even though they are governed by the narcotics law. That is about all I can say.

DEAN BEATTY: Are they dangerous to conduct?

DR. WEINSTEIN: Yes, they are dangerous to conduct inasmuch as the individual under the influence will commit acts that normally he would not. However, as Dr. Alberstadt points out, it is not addicting in the true sense of the word since physical withdrawal symptoms are not as apparent as they are with other narcotics such as the formin groups or others.

DEAN RICHARD VERN WALLE (Champlain College, Burlington, Vermont): LSD, mescaline, etc., drugs that are addictive in nature, are habituating?

DR. WEINSTEIN: LSD and the mescaline group of drugs, as I said before, are used at present for investigational purposes. They do not seem to be addicting in the true sense of the word. They are hallucinogenic drugs. The person using these drugs sees and hears things that normally he does not. As a matter of fact, the dosages that are used have not been worked out properly for therapeutic purposes. They do have a therapeutic purpose inasmuch as

they make certain otherwise unreachable individuals more amenable to psychiatric treatment. They have more rapport with the psychiatrist. For this purpose they are considered valuable psychiatric tools. But to date the exact dosage on a milligram per kilogram weight basis, e.g., has not been worked out. We do know that in large doses they have detrimental effects on the individual.

DEAN C. T. MacLEOD (Claremont Men's College, Claremont, California): You seem to pass over the marijuana thing with the same sort of feeling that Time Magazine passed over it, that it is not a serious weed to use. With the federal code as I know it, at least two of our boys face trial and are subject to a five year mandatory penalty in the penitentiary. It would seem to me either you must change the code, or tell the people that this is serious to bring it into the country or possess it for resale.

DR. WEINSTEIN: I did not want to give the impression that this is an innocuous substance. Unfortunately these are the wrong people to address your question to. Marijuana and other opiates are under the narcotics act, and we do not enforce that and have nothing to do with it.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Let me say that I think a distinction has to be drawn here. I do not think anyone is saying, and you just proved it by indicating the terrible consequences of getting caught selling marijuana is five years in jail -- no one is underestimating the problem involved. It is simply that the problem is limited, at least it appears to be limited, to the extent that people who utilize it, when they utilize it, may engage in anti-social acts of one kind or another, some of them terribly serious and much like the ones you have heard about -- murders and everything else -- but it is not habituating or addicting. Once you finish with it, I gather, you do not have any tremendous craving or need to utilize it. That is the distinction we are trying to make and that most people do make in that area.

But do not be left with the impression that it is a minor matter. As a matter of fact, they have new mandatory jail sentences now for this type of drug and it is a terribly serious thing to get caught violating the law in that respect.

DEAN MacLEOD: I understand also that when you fail to get the same feeling from marijuana, you also go on to the next harder narcotic. That is the danger.

DR. WEINSTEIN: This is true. It is a stepping stone to the morphine derivatives.

DEAN ARNO J. HAACK (Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri): I am a bit confused between your function

and narcotics. Locally, in metropolitan St. Louis, we deal with the narcotics squad of the local authorities. At what point should we be dealing with you?

MR. GOTTLIEB: We only enforce the federal law with respect to certain drugs. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics enforces the federal law with respect to the hard narcotics, so-called. Every state and every city has its own laws in this regard. If it is a purely local problem, and the laws are adequate and the enforcement procedures are sufficiently alive in that area, it may be that the local people can handle the situation better.

On the other hand, in most cases, it takes federal authority to actually bring to bear sufficient amounts of manpower and effort to stamp this thing out.

Actually the local police people do cooperate, as Mr. Hansen indicated, with the federal people when they see it really is a federal problem, not just a small local situation going on.

DIRECTOR PHILIP PRICE (New York University, New York, New York): One place, and only one place, have I read that alcohol in the system combined with barbiturates in the system creates a chemical reaction which develops a poison which will lead to death. I have seen it in only one place. Is this true?

DR. WEINSTEIN: Dr. Alberstadt.

DR. ALBERSTADT: I have never heard or read that. They add to each other's effect, both being depressants on the nervous system, so there is an added danger of poisoning from barbiturates if somebody has been drinking heavily, but no special chemical reaction.

DIRECTOR PRICE: It was probably in the medical journal, The Readers' Digest. (Laughter)

DR. WEINSTEIN: That is the authoritative magazine.

REV. C. KEITH PAYNE (YMCA Central Atlantic Area Council, Newark, New Jersey): On the first page of your speech you have reference to a rather educated or some sort of guess in terms of when college students might use barbiturates and amphetamines, namely at final examination time.

I would suggest that this may or may not be a helpful guess, because it may throw us off the track a little bit as to really when a student is apt to use this, in terms of what it is that may be pressing a student to use amphetamines or barbiturates. I suggest it is not necessarily the pressure of the college curriculum that does this, that there are other factors, many other factors operating here

just as there are in the psychoneurotic field, that there is no one thing we can put our finger on.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you.

DEAN LOUIS C. STAMATAKOS (Grand Valley State College, Allendale, Michigan): Sometime ago there was some talk about the use of morning glory seeds as a hallucinatory drug. Is your organization concerned with the use of morning glory seeds?

Secondly, could you inform us a little bit about the background of the seed and how it is used as a hallucinatory drug or effect?

DR. WEINSTEIN: The answer to the first part is, yes, we are very concerned with morning glory seeds. It is a hallucinogenic drug. It is very similar to the mescaline, LSD group. And it is illegal at present under any prescription or anything. It is purely in the investigational stage. It is also a tool, a psychiatric tool in the investigational stage. You cannot write a prescription and have it filled in the drug store for morning glory seed.

DEAN STAMATAKOS: No, but you can buy that stuff at any garden center. (Laughter)

DR. WEINSTEIN: Yes. That is right. Very many drugs may be bought as herbicides, or pesticides, or for other purposes, or even veterinary use, for example, in order to circumvent the law. But from a legal sense they are not for sale, for drug use.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: I attended a narcotics convention and they said there is only a special kind of morning glory seed that does this. It is a blue type and it was pulled off the market.

DR. WEINSTEIN: I am afraid I cannot answer that. I do not know about the special type. There is a special type of poppy seed, for example, from which opium is obtained. It is the unripened part of the European poppy which is rich in opium content. On morning glory seeds I have no expertise.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Has your Department contemplated the publication of anything that would assist college administrators in the detection, analysis, and description of the various drugs which are very popular, we understand, with college students?

DR. WEINSTEIN: Mr. Yakowitz, you have been silent. Will you answer that?

MR. YAKOWITZ: We are not contemplating issuing any particular bulletin, but there have been a number of

speeches made before Congress. For example, there is before Congress right now a bill which would greatly help Food and Drug Administration in dealing with the amphetamine and barbiturate problem. Commissioner Larrick spoke before a Congressional Committee concerning this, and he gave quite a bit of the kind of information that has been discussed here and which you are asking about. But we have never published a bulletin directed particularly to the college deans and people who are administrators in colleges concerning the problem.

If you folks think there is a need for such a particular bulletin, I will be glad to carry that message back to the folks who work up such special publications.

DR. WEINSTEIN: Time for just one.

DEAN G. R. SCHWARTZ (Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois): On our campuses, probably the people who would be most apt to be aware of violations and the effects of misuse of drugs would be our medical staffs. Have you any suggestions for us in so far -- this could get involved in professional doctor-patient relationships, confidential privileged information and so forth -- have you any suggestions for us regarding this relationship and coordination and cooperation with our medical staff people, health services, and so forth?

DR. WEINSTEIN: If I understand this question correctly, the relationship between the physician and the student --

DEAN SCHWARTZ: The relationship between us, as deans of students, deans of men, with our own medical staffs with regard to this over-all matter?

DR. WEINSTEIN: You mean to tell the student to go to the health center?

DEAN SCHWARTZ: No. Suppose our university physician and his staff run across situations where they suspect the misuse of drugs of this type. Normally a physician will not reveal confidential information given to him under most circumstances as privileged information, the ethics of the medical profession being involved. Suppose then he has information of this type, or he strongly thinks he does, how should we work with him, or how should he work with us reciprocally in this area?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Usually the physician-patient privilege -- which is a state matter. There is no federal privilege, incidentally -- involves the information which the patient gives to the physician which is necessary for the physician to have to treat him. That is the basic situation. If a physician suspects that the patient who has

come to him for exhaustion, cold, or hangnail, is taking drugs, his divulgence of that suspicion does not, in my judgment, involve the physician-patient privilege relationship.

DEAN JOEL S. RUDY (Hunter College, Bronx, New York): Not long ago, about January 8th of this year, New York State sponsored a narcotic conference, a non-narcotic and narcotic addiction conference. To an extent I disagree with Dr. Alberstadt when he said the illegal traffic in amphetamines is greater, and I think this is what he said, or we are more concerned with this than they are with the illegal traffic of marijuana.

I think it was shown in this conference, as it has been shown in many of the other publications appearing across the country, on the college campuses we have a greater problem with marijuana than we do with amphetamines, and by the questions evidenced here, I think this was quite obvious.

May I make one statement, since there seems to be a lot of concern about information on narcotics and on marijuana. The International Narcotics Enforcement Officers Association, which is centered at 80 Holland Avenue in Albany under the direction of the State Narcotics Control of New York, has made available several publications involving legal cases, as well as information on identifying certain drugs, and identifying the different uses of marijuana and different approaches that can be taken, and membership in this organization is open to college administrators and is encouraged. So you will receive annual and monthly publications concerning the different drug uses on the campuses.

Somebody asked before from New York if there were any publications available such as this, and they do have a publication from the INEOA on this. It is John Bellisi, who is Director of State Narcotic Control from Albany, who will be happy to answer any questions. They are also very willing to sponsor panel discussions at the individual colleges. This was something that was highly encouraged at the conference, that the colleges take the initiative to have panels at the colleges open to both faculty and students. They will be more than happy to come to the campus.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: I do not know whether any of you happened to see the article in a current magazine written by Huston Smith. I do not know whether you know Huston Smith or not. He is a wonderful person and a fantastic philosopher and a wonderful theologian. In the article he was referring to some experiments that had been performed by theological students and their professors with regard to the use of drugs in producing religious experiences, and in there indicated that ten students and faculty members together, experimenting on this, had what they described as the most significant religious experiences they had ever had.

This seems to raise some interesting questions in my mind. (Laughter) Considering the number of church goers we have. (Laughter)

Incidentally, if I am not mistaken, I think that the use of these charts with the pills on them, you would like to have controlled, as I understand.

MR. HANSEN: We would prefer you did not pass them out to students and things of this nature. They are designed primarily for law enforcement officers, or any folks interested in preventing drug abuse.

Now that I have the mike, I wonder if I might mention about the poppy seeds and LSD. We know it is a violation. We want to know every instance you find of students using or misusing any of these drugs. We get in and investigate and make cases on them.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: I would like to exert a Chairman's privilege here and ask one question. I think at our institution we are concerned with educating students. I raised this question with Dr. Satus in Milwaukee with regard to educational programs that might be carried on, and he seemed to be rather hesitant about this from the idea of developing interest perhaps more than educating the individuals in the use of these.

MR. HANSEN: There are two sides to the coin. Some claim the more publicity you get, the more misuse you get. Actually we have a group in our Bureau who are voluntarily trying to work up a program. They will be contacting you folks with the idea of an educational approach to the whole problem. Actually, we believe the educational approach is the proper one.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: I would like to point out to those of you who acted today on your restructuring that we are continuing work in this area. This has started recently, and this was a rather sudden move to get this information to you.

In one of the issues of the Journal which will be coming out, we will be carrying articles with regard to the use and misuse of drugs, and I think this might be helpful to you. Some of the information has already been gathered. We are going to get more. So we will be following up on this.

To finish, I would like to certainly express my appreciation, and I am sure the appreciation of the group. I think this has been not only interesting, but stimulating and educational. We are deeply indebted to all of you for being with us. (Applause)

... The seminar adjourned at three-five o'clock ...

CONFERENCE BANQUET
Tuesday - April 6, 1965

The Anniversary Conference Banquet convened in the Cotillion Room at six forty-five o'clock, President Yanitelli presiding.

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Ladies and Gentlemen, may I ask you please to rise for the invocation that will be delivered by Dean Philip Price, Director of Student Activities at New York University.

DIRECTOR PHILIP PRICE (Director of Student Activities, New York University): Let us pray.

God of truth, who has given man the power to reason, experiment and discovery are ever beckoning him to offer understanding and deeper wisdom, help us, Thy servants, who are meeting here, that our concern be for our students themselves that their bewilderment be brief, their prospect be constantly enlarged, their minds and spirits alert, both to all the campus and classroom and to all that Thou can bring to their lives. To this end, bless this food to our use, and our lives to Thy service. Amen.

... Dinner was served ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Ladies and Gentlemen: Unaccustomed as I am to free speech (laughter) -- thank you. It was Ad Brugger's joke. I am reminded of the preacher -- and you must bear with this -- who, having done no preparation for his sermon, began as we preachers always do to go on and on and on. You see, the trick is you go back either to the creation or to the flood. Those are two good focal points for a preacher. (Laughter)

Having started there, and proceeding through, he began with the major prophets, and was going through the minor prophets, one after the other, and finally came to the prophet Habakkuk. He said, "O, what shall I do about Habakkuk?" By this time one of his parishoners said, "Look, let him have my seat. I'm tired and I'm going to go home." (Laughter)

I hope to keep the meeting moving, and a little brevity in it.

I would like very much to introduce the table to you, the dais. I will ask you please to withhold your wild applause until all of them are on their feet. To give each one of them the applause that is due to them would keep us here far past midnight.

Therefore I call upon Thomas Emmet, the Conference Chairman for the next three years, to stand.

Past President Jim McLeod, Northwestern. Mrs. Fred Turner, the wife of our Historian. Richard Hulet, our Placement Officer. Mrs. Alan Johnson. Your Conference Chairman, O. D. Roberts. Next to him Mrs. Carl Knox, the wife of our Secretary-Treasurer. Dave Robinson, Vice President. Robert Etheridge, who served under me.

Our new president for next year, and the leader of the study on student and social issues, Dean Williamson of Northwestern -- (Laughter and applause) I just transferred him -- Minnesota.

PRESIDENT DESIGNATE WILLIAMSON: Okay, Jim?

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: My favorite prayer, Phil Price of New York University.

I shall skip the next man because I want to do something with him later, probably a Latin kiss on both cheeks. (Laughter) I shall skip our speaker and go on.

Vice President John Blackburn. Ad Brugger of the University of California at Los Angeles. Mrs. Roberts, the wife of our Conference Chairman. Carl Knox, the Secretary-Treasurer. Mrs. James McLeod, the wife of our past president. Earle Clifford of Rutgers, New Brunswick, and many other campuses. They are taking over the state of New Jersey. Alan Johnson of the College Student Personnel Institute. Fred Turner, our Historian. Richard Siggelkow, the editor of our Journal. Ken Venderbush, member of the Executive Committee from Lawrence College.

And now let your emotions go. (Applause)

For the sake of brevity, I am going to call upon the different committees and people that joined us, but not by name.

I would ask the Georgetown University group to rise and stand, and bear with us, please. The Catholic University group. The Howard University group. The George Washington University group. The American University group. The Gallaudet College group. Ladies and gentlemen, these people have been just marvelous. (Applause) The University of Maryland, with my apologies, please rise. (Applause) This is one of those moments when you wish the ground would open up and swallow you.

I said I was not going to call on any individual in these groups, but there is one person to whom I would like to call your attention. You know, they say that every good man has a good woman behind him somewhere, and I would like to introduce to you Armour Blackburn's mother, who came here with him, to thank her for giving us a guy like Armour in the Association. Mrs. Blackburn. (Applause)

One more individual, one of the fellows who has been working behind the scenes for the Association practically all year long, day after day -- well, I would say day after day, but it always gets to about three months before Conference time when it goes day and night after day and night -- a man to whom I personally cannot be too grateful for the way he has arranged the works of this meeting and of other meetings at which I have attended, a man the effects of whose good work we all experience without really seeing him do the things, the fellow behind the scenes for the last three years, O. D. Roberts.

... The dinner guests arose and applauded ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I thank you for expressing our thanks to O. D. Bless you, O.D. Thanks a million.

I would like now to call on Fred Turner for a few small items of business.

DEAN TURNER (Resolutions): President Vic, Members of the Association: I would like to present to the Association two resolutions, one with regret, and one with great pleasure. I would like to offer first:

RESOLVED: That the National Association of Personnel Administrators pause in its 47th Anniversary Conference to mark with regret and sorrow the passing, since our last meeting, of Dean Joseph Somerville, Dean of Men Emeritus, of Ohio Wesleyan University. Dean Somerville served his own institution and our Association with distinction and his genial presence will be missed by his many friends.

I move that a copy of this resolution be spread in the minutes of the 47th Conference, and notice of this resolution be transmitted to Ohio Wesleyan University and the family of Dean Somerville. I so move.

... Cries of "Second" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: A motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor please signify by saying aye; anybody opposed? Be it so carried. I would ask also that we rise for a moment for a thirty second silence in his honor.

... The assembly arose and stood in silent tribute to the memory of Dean Somerville ...

DEAN TURNER: I would like to offer a second resolution which is in several parts, but I believe it can be taken as one resolution.

RESOLVED: That the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in 47th Anniversary Conference

assembled takes special notice and expresses its great appreciation:

1. To all of the members and their wives of the local committees on arrangements and special projects for their outstanding activities.

2. To Howard University, American University, Georgetown University, Catholic University America, Gallaudet University, University of Maryland, Loyola College, Towson State College --

Armour, have I missed anyone?

DEAN BLACKBURN: No, you haven't.

DEAN TURNER: -- for their generous allowance of time and services of their faculty, staff and student members, who have done so much to make our Washington visit profitable, pleasant and entertaining, and whose unfailing courtesy, patience, and hospitality have given special enjoyment to all of us.

3. To Georgetown University, Howard University and American University for extending to us the pleasure of the use of their splendid facilities.

4. To our many guests who have appeared on our program as speakers, panelists, participants and representatives of distinguished and learned societies for their contributions to our sessions.

5. To the management of the Sheraton Park Hotel and its staff for their cooperation and special attention to our convention needs.

Mr. President, I move that these resolutions be placed in the record of the Conference, and that the individuals and institutions involved be notified of our action.

... Cries of "Second" ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: The motion is made and seconded. All those in favor of the motion just made please signify by saying aye; opposed. Be it so carried and, Mr. Secretary, I ask that it be carried out by notifying the people.

The motion just read expresses the thanks and appreciation to special guests and to the participants who gave of their time and experience. I would like them to rise for you, for your applause and our thanks. (Applause)

We now stand on the threshold of an entertainment by the George Washington University choir, and the moment,

shall I say, is one of tense suspense. (Laughter) We do not know whether they are here yet. (Laughter) If I had brought my banjo or guitar I would sing you a little song. At this moment we will pause. Please talk with each other while we find out.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to announce our choir had trouble in the pouring-down rain. They are here and we will have them in about five or ten minutes. I ask you not to go home yet -- otherwise, we will have to lock the doors. [Recess]

May I ask you to find your seats, and may I ask you to help me find a way to get people back to their seats after I have lost them? (Laughter)

It is with great pleasure that we present to you this evening the George Washington University Singing Group under the direction of Jule Zawaba, Director of the University Choir at George Washington University. (Applause)

... Entertainment by the George Washington University Singing Group ...

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Ladies and Gentlemen, your applause for the George Washington Choir. (Applause)

Now, by order of the Chair, everybody stand up and change their position for thirty seconds. [All arise] It is so ordered. Thank you very much.

Your speaker for this evening is a man who has a triple orientation in higher education, journalism and government. He did his undergraduate work at Iowa State Teachers College and his graduate work at Minnesota and the University of Iowa. If I were to read the vitae that I have, it would be longer than a speech, I am sure.

Briefly, he has experience in journalism, he was a sports editor, which gives him an affinity for us, and an editorial writer and columnist for the Daily Iowan of Iowa City and the Manhattan Tribune News at Manhattan, Kansas.

He is a Navy man with experience in World War II, a communications officer both overseas and at home. He has taught at the University of Iowa, Kansas State, and Drake. He was the provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Penn State and at the same time he was teaching International Relations.

With this journalistic and higher education orientation he came to Washington in March of 1961 as an Associate Director of the Peace Corps when Sargent Shriver was just getting the thing rolling. In September of 1962 the American Council on Education lured him away from the Peace

Corps to become Associate Executive Director for the Commission on Academic Affairs.

He is in a whole flock of national and honorary and professional fraternities and educational and professional associations -- the Association of Higher Education, the American Political Science Association, American Association of University Professors, to mention only a few -- and at the same time his work is oriented toward service for the community.

He has been a friend of NASPA. We have heard him before. We feel that with his association with the American Council on Education we have learned a lot and have been given access to a deeper, more intelligent, more professional approach to our own work. He is a hard-headed friend of NASPA though, and that makes him a real friend.

It is a pleasure to give you Mr. Lawrence Dennis of the American Council on Education, speaking to you on "Will Success Spoil Higher Education?" Mr. Dennis. (Applause)

MR. LAWRENCE DENNIS (Director, Commission on Academic Affairs, American Council on Education): Thank you, Father Vic. Could we have the lights down, please? (Laughter)

It is a pleasure to be with you again, having had the privilege of sharing your meeting in Evanston two years ago. I believe I should say at the outset, having had that very gracious introduction by Father Yanitelli, that I have been very struck this past year or so since we have grown acquainted at how many people know Father Vic. And he knows this and is really not very modest about it. As a matter of fact, when we first met a year or so ago, I noticed we were at a meeting in New York City and I noticed that everybody seemed to know Father Vic. I mentioned it to him. He said, "Oh, yes, Larry, ask anybody around here, Jersey City, Newark, they all know Father Vic."

I said, "I bet you ten dollars that you don't know Mayor Wagner." He said, "Oh yes, I know Mayor Wagner." So we went over to Gracie Mansion and knocked at the door and the Mayor answered the door, and said, "Father Vic, come on in." So I lost my first ten dollars.

A few weeks later we were at another professional meeting here in Washington, and I wanted to recoup that bet. I bet Father Yanitelli double or nothing that he didn't know the President of the United States. He said, "Oh yes, Larry, I have known L.B.J. for years." He said, "Come on over to the White House." As we went into the White House gate the President's car came out and the President leaned out the back window and said, "Father Yanitelli, be with you in a few minutes." So I lost my second roll.

A few months went by and I was still somewhat covetous of this money and rather taken by this good Father's popularity. Then just last month he and I had the privilege of attending a professional meeting together in Rome. (Laughter) And I thought, this was my chance, "I'm going to get even." I said, "Father Vic, I will bet you don't know the Pope." He said, "Larry, you will never learn. Come on over to the Vatican with me."

So we went over to the Vatican and he said, "Now, you stand down here and you watch on that balcony up there, and I am going into the Vatican, and in a little while you will see whether or not I know the Pontiff." And sure enough, a few minutes after Father Yanitelli entered the Vatican, out on the balcony came Pope Paul and Father Vic, chatting amiably, arm in arm and I was standing there crest-fallen seeing another bet winging its way into his pocket, when a little Italian urchin tugged at my trouser leg and I looked down, and this little youngster looked up at me and said, "Sir, would you mind telling me who is that up there with Father Vic?" (Laughter and applause)

I want first of all to bring you greetings from the American Council on Education and its President, Dr. Logan Wilson. By coincidence, ACE will this year also be holding its 47th annual meeting and, as many of you know, it will be in Washington at the Mayflower Hotel October 6th to 8th, and our theme this year is "The Student in Higher Education."

We have been privileged in developing this theme under the aegis of the Commission on Academic Affairs, to have had the close cooperation of many of your distinguished members, including Dr. Joseph Kauffman of our staff, who will soon, as you know, become Dean of Students and Professor of Education at the University of Wisconsin; your distinguished Past President Jack Clevenger, who is a member of the Commission on Academic Affairs, and many others.

Although the annual meeting of the Council is for the presidents of the member institutions and organizations, we do hope this year that you men and women here will be able to persuade your presidents to permit you to attend this meeting with them and at their side, for we know that this program that we are developing will be of significance to all of the very fine work that you are all doing throughout the country.

I have chosen tonight to talk about the theme "Will Success Spoil Higher Education," because I believe we are at a point in time when we need, as you have been doing here, to take careful stock of where the academic enterprise is in this country and where it is leading.

A curious contradiction manifests itself in higher

education these days. We are, on the one hand, obviously at a point in history when higher education has at long last come into its own. The blue chips are on the table. We are entering the era of fulfillment of all of our hopes and dreams in terms of the kind of public support and financial underpinning that the academic enterprise requires.

I noticed just the other day, when I received an invitation to attend my 25th college class reunion in Cedar Falls, Iowa, this next month, that four years prior to that, in 1936, the high school debate topic was, "Should there be federal aid to education?" It has taken just about thirty years, three decades, to climax that question in the affirmative.

I think it is clear that the great society which the President has so eloquently outlined for us is to be a learning society. We now have, or are on the brink of having, a total federal commitment to education and particularly to higher education. You have all read President Johnson's statements indicating his complete commitment to the concept that every young person in this country should have as much education as he can profitably absorb.

You have been reading in the papers these past few days the great progress that the Congress of the United States is making toward enactment of still another piece of milestone education legislation which today, incidentally, was voted out of the Senate committee for debate by the full Senate, having already passed the House.

This education act of 1965 comes in the wake of the Higher Education Facilities Act, Medical Education Act, Vocational Technical Education Act, the extension of the National Defense Education Act, the Economic Opportunity and Civil Rights Acts, which have important aspects relating to education, and this bill, as you know, provides federal assistance to education across the board -- elementary, secondary, higher and adult education. It is indeed the consummation of decades of planning and effort by the educational and political communities.

Just contrast this climate of today, if you will, in your minds with the climate of 1960 or 1955, or 1950. These federal enactments reflect the high hopes and the great expectations of our citizenry when it comes to education. We are all aware of the new importance of college going in our society, of the economic opportunity that a university education opens up to all people, about the vocational, professional and liberal objectives of a college education, of the social status that accrues to one with some form of higher education. Walter Lippmann recently said that education has become vestibule in our society from which all corridors of opportunity lead. The recent polls by Louis Harris Associates indicate the high family expectations with reference to

college going. The great majority of families in this country expect their sons and daughters to go to college.

The importance of this growing public support for, commitment to, and interest in higher education is dramatically underscored by the fact that by 1970 fifty percent of the people in this country will be under 25 years of age, and if you have recently had a chance to look at such books as Donald Michael's "The Next Generation," you know that in tomorrow's world, which is so rapidly unfolding, young people will pursue their formal education until their middle twenties; they will need to learn to be capable of holding four or five different jobs in their lifetimes; they will continue their education, both for work and for leisure, as adults; they will retire, so to speak, in their mid sixties, while still pursuing more education as senior citizens; and live much longer and, hopefully, much more enriched lives than they do today.

We are indeed on the threshold of the learning society. Yet, at this very threshold of success, as gaged by public support, higher education has recently entered what I believe is a crisis of integrity that unfortunately and tragically is largely of our own making.

All elements in the academic community are involved in this crisis -- faculty, students, administrators, trustees, alumni.

The Berkeley incidents, the demonstrations on other campuses are symptoms of this crisis which has, of course, been mounting slowly over the past decade. It is not that integrity of higher education is suddenly vanishing, but rather that an erosion of integrity has taken place gradually through recent years, until now, that is due in no small measure to the students themselves, we are perhaps luckily confronted with the crisis in undergraduate education that must be resolved quickly by the academic community, else, in my judgment, it will be resolved by the expectant American public, perhaps to the deterioration of the academic community.

What has caused this crisis of integrity, this corrosion of the integrity of undergraduate education?

In a very tragically ironic sense we are victims of our own success, the kinds of success I mentioned a few moments ago as manifested in current federal support. We have been in some ways spoiled by so much attention and so much support; so many things have happened in higher education in such a relatively short span of time, that we have not been able to keep our house in order.

Let me give you my bill of particulars, and I recognize that every analyst would have his own. But

specifically, in my judgment, the crisis of integrity that we face is compounded of these dozen or so factors.

First, there has been a progressive downgrading of the teaching function, and an upgrading of research, both by faculty members and administrators. Undergraduate instruction, by and large, across the country, has suffered as a result of the research efforts of our institutions.

Secondly, quite ironic, considering the new levels of federal support we are about to witness, federal grants have had an impact on institutional priorities. In the words of the song from Mary Poppins, "A spoonful of sugar makes the medicine go down," and it has taken only a spoonful of sugar on a number of distinguished university campuses, in some cases, to turn the value structure upside down, to elevate research to the point where it is sacrosanct and to impinge on the teaching or instructional function of the institution.

Third, many institutions have lost their sense of mission or purpose. They are trying to be too many things to too many people.

Fourth, the increase of pressures on young people, on our students, the tests that they are subjected to, beginning early in their high school years, the admissions requirements, the status factors, the parental pressures, the drive for excellence, and so on, all of these factors that have built up within the past decade have compounded our problem and have contributed to our crisis.

Fifth, the separation of student personnel services from the rest of the academic community has resulted, in some cases, in what might be termed an over-professionalization of student personnel administration, a separation with the academic on the one side and the non-academic on the other. This has resulted, on some campuses, in what I regard as a very regrettable distinction of the classroom or the academic portion of the campus under the jurisdiction of one set of administrative officers, while the so-called extra classroom or outside-of-class activities have been under the jurisdiction of another set of administrative officers in the collegiate organization.

I will have some further comments on this topic, which of course is much closer to your areas of interest, in a few moments, and I shall not attempt to speak at all as one who is knowledgeable in any great detail about the field of student personnel administration. I might say that what little I know about the field I learned at Ed Williamson's knee and at other joints in Minneapolis. (Laughter)

Sixth, there has been a breakdown in many institutions in communications between faculty and students, admin-

istrators and students, and faculty and administrators.

Seventh is the very regrettable lack of faculty interest in educational problems, and it is at this portion of this address when I think probably it ought to be delivered two or three days from now when the AAUP meets here, rather than here tonight.

Eighth, I am always struck in a very depressing way by the willingness of faculty members and parents in PTA meetings in college towns to lambaste what goes on in secondary and elementary school systems, to criticize what goes on in the public schools, but at the same time to be adamant in their unwillingness to correct educational problems in their own institutions.

It is regrettable when you look over the programs of national organizations, such as the American Association of University Professors, American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association, the American Physics Society, the American Council of Learned Societies, etc., etc., all of the learned professional, academic discipline societies, faculty oriented, over the past ten years, and find scarcely any attention to fundamental educational and instructional problems on their agendas. I think I should add, in hope, a word of praise for the recent formation of the National Academy of Education, under the presidency of Dr. Ralph Heilo. Nevertheless, this lack of faculty interest in educational problems has contributed to the present crisis.

Ninth. Another contributory factor which you have all been talking about here is the simple fact of bigness, so-called depersonalization of higher education, which Father Yanitelli, among others, addressed himself to in his presidential talk the other day.

Tenth is the lack of curricular reform in our educational institutions. It has been said over and over again that changing a curriculum is like moving Yosemite. One of the tragedies of our time, however, is that colleges and universities do not have the time at their disposal, that might once have been the case, to change curriculae, to bring programs and courses in touch with the realities of today. Time is moving too fast. The young men and women it is our privilege to serve today intend to be on the moon in the next decade. We haven't got the time to consume the endless hours in faculty debate about curricular changes that was once our luxury. We need desperately reform throughout the curriculum in many of our colleges and universities.

Eleventh. Another contributory factor to the crisis is the rigidity in our procedures which mitigate transfer students, against work study programs, against service opportunities, which tend to add to the drop-out

problem. I do not know what it takes to develop more flexibility in administration policies and in institutional procedures, but in one way or another I think our young people and their parents are going to see to it that that flexibility develops.

Twelfth. Another very important, significant factor in our crisis of integrity, one to which we could devote an entire meeting such as this, is the lack of opportunity, the tragic lack of opportunity for our disadvantaged youth, the desperate need to bring minority groups, and particularly Negroes, into the main stream of higher education, through compensatory higher educational opportunities, if and when necessary.

Thirteenth. Another factor is the busy-ness that so often overloads our faculty committees which ought to be devoting themselves to such matters as curricular reform, the excessive dabbling in administrative and clerical details to the neglect of teaching and scholarly pursuits that characterizes so much activity of faculties on so many campuses.

Fourteen. Another reason why there has been erosion of integrity in higher education is what I think is the growing lack of a sense of public responsibility and accountability within the academic community, the preoccupation with gown, if you please, to the neglect of town; a kind of academic narcissism, an inward-looking tendency that we all develop, thinking that what goes on on our campuses is our business and not the public's business.

Lastly, but certainly not least, on my list of factors is our failure to understand today's young people, the fact that we have neglected to realize that this post-Sputnik generation is smarter, more alert, by and large way ahead of all of us, faculty and administration alike, eager to use power, but regrettably not yet fully aware of how to use power responsibly.

Now, it is my general point of view here this evening, and one which we try to press home in various fronts for the last year or so, that if the institutions of higher education do not move swiftly to deal with this crisis of integrity, to deal with these factors I have listed, to which you could add, I am sure, a number of other causes, that if our institutions do not deal with this crisis, the public itself will, for today's parents, today's citizens fully expect their sons and daughters, as I said earlier, to go to college. In one way or another they are going to get the educational opportunity that they feel is their due.

In the process of their investing considerable tax money and a good deal of private money into the higher education establishment, the public is -- correctly in my judgment -- going to begin asking a great many very tough

questions about what goes on in higher education. It is up to us, then, to rebuild the integrity of undergraduate education, to see to it that our house is indeed in order, so that when these questions come, so that when the public scrutiny turns our way, we can face those it is our privilege to serve in a straightforward manner and in an open and proud manner in terms of what goes on.

What then can we do, specifically?

I shall not take up time this evening to talk about what the students might do, though I think it would be very profitable, perhaps as one of the outcomes of the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, and as an outgrowth of these many discussions so many organizations are having this year, if the student leaders themselves, both through their organization and independently throughout the country, would begin to hold a series of forums on the responsible student in today's academic world.

I shall concentrate tonight principally on what the faculty might do and what the administration might do. I am not going to talk about public institutions on the one hand or private institutions on the other, or one type of educator on the one hand or another type of educator on the other. This is, after all, the ecumenical year, a time when we are all engaged in a common enterprise.

Having been introduced tonight by Father Yanitelli and speaking of the ecumenical movement, reminds me of the story of the ecumenical conference golf tournament which took place last year. During a recess in the ecumenical council one of the Cardinals present -- and as you know, there were in attendance at the council representatives of all the faiths from all over the world -- one of the Cardinals present proposed that they have an open golf tournament, and it was put to a vote. The Italian Cardinals present, of course, voted against it, but the motion carried. (Laughter)

Before the tournament was staged one of the Cardinals who had opposed the motion went to the Pope and said, "You know, the main reason we opposed this tournament was that everyone here are representatives of all these faiths, Moslems, Buddhists, etc., from all over the world. How can we be sure that a Catholic is going to win the tournament?"

The Pope said, "Don't worry, the cause is in good hands and I will take care of it." So he immediately got on the phone with one Samuel Snead of the United States and he talked to Mr. Snead about coming over and participating in the tournament. Sam Snead said, "Well, Your Holiness, you know, I am a layman. I am not of the clergy. And even though I am a golf professional, wouldn't it be a little out of character for me to participate in the tournament?" The Pope said, "It's perfectly all right, Sam. I have this

new authority to make you an instant Cardinal, and we will have your robes waiting for you, and when you land in Rome everything will be taken care of. I will arrange to have an honorarium also placed at your disposal."

So Sam Snead flew over from the United States to Rome and Cardinal Sam Snead was entered in the golf tournament. (Laughter) The tournament was held and the Pontiff took up the score cards and began totaling up the scores, and lo and behold Cardinal Samuel Snead had come in second. The Pontiff took Mr. Snead to one side and said, "Look, I gave you a very generous honorarium to come over here. I ran considerable risk with my colleagues in the clergy, dressing you in the raiment of a Cardinal, and you have a distinguished record as a professional golfer and now you lose the tournament. What goes?"

Mr. Snead said, "Your Holiness, did you look at the name of the winner of the tournament? Rabbi Arnold Palmer." (Laughter)

Well, in that ecumenical spirit I offer these, what I hope are specific and constructive and worthwhile suggestions to you here this evening as to what faculty members and administrators might do to cope with this crisis in higher education. Some of these have already been suggested by a few of the factors I delineated earlier.

First, by the faculty:

1. Cut back on committee work and housekeeping chores. I know of one faculty member at a distinguished western institution who went to his president the last year with a deal. He said, "Look, I am on a half dozen committees, I am doing semi-clerical work in the department; you have me running all over the country looking for grants. I really would like to teach, and I will make a deal with you. If you relieve me of these committee responsibilities, I will double my teaching load and try to do a much better and more effective job." The president said, "You're on."

I do not know what the local AAUP chapter has said to that gentleman, but nonetheless it is the kind of enterprise I think we need, however unusual it might be.

Faculty members these days are, as I said earlier, much too loaded down with these chores, not always of their own making. This is oftentimes, I think, a reflection on the administration itself. But one thing that could be done would be to have a cutback in committee work and the so-called housekeeping chores.

Secondly, and this would be for those department heads and deans who hold faculty rank, restore the importance of the teaching function. You can read lip-service

statements paying tribute to the teaching function by most deans and most presidents, but you do not really find many institutions where something special has been done about it, and I think leadership at the department head and academic dean level is important in this connection.

Faculty could also write and publish more about educational problems. I think that we may be entering a new period in this regard. The economists, for example, have recently discovered education, and it is respectable for economists to do studies about education. Historians are beginning to discover education, and perhaps it will not be too long before other disciplines begin to see that it is important for them to study, write, publish and analyze about educational problems. But certainly a much greater premium needs to be placed on this kind of research and analysis.

Next, faculty members could devote entire meetings of national professional organizations to matters related to improvement of instruction and to the need for experimentation in undergraduate education.

Next, faculty members working through the committees on promotion, salary, tenure, could make the institutional reward system meaningful by supporting good teachers across the board. I do not mean by simply the annual grant of \$1,000 to the distinguished teacher on the campus, though all of those things need to be encouraged and broadened. I mean the kind of promotion, salary adjustment policies that are set usually by senior professors within the department, policies that would reflect the genuine commitment to effective teaching.

Next, faculty members in the disciplines and in the professions ought to stop sneering at schools of education and particularly at programs designed to prepare college teachers, and ought to get behind such programs.

In my judgment, every major college and university ought to have on its campus on-going programs designed, first, to attract outstanding undergraduates in college teaching, and secondly to prepare graduate students for college teaching.

Next, there ought to be consideration on the part of faculties in at least some institutions to adopt the idea recently advanced by John Fischer, the editor of Harper's Magazine when he suggested that the teaching function be separated from the grading and testing function, and that those who teach, plan and teach their course according to the objectives and outcomes that they have designed, but that the testing of the capabilities of students who take those courses be left to outside agencies who would come in and evaluate the tests and grade the students according to

those objectives. This would involve both the teacher and the student with the subject matter and not divert their attention through the matter of tests and grades.

I think Mr. Fischer's idea, which, as you know, is commonplace in some parts of Europe, ought to at least be tried in some institutions of this country.

Next, faculty members ought to revise and reform the curriculum, particularly in the social sciences and humanities. I think in the sciences a good deal of progress has been made, and there ought to be some reward, some premium placed on efforts to reform the curriculum.

Next, faculty members should strengthen the advising and counseling services through much greater participation.

I know many of these sound like preachments, and some of them are old hat to you, but it is indeed discouraging to any observer of the higher education scene to talk to students on campuses, as I have these past two or three years, to see how many of them are simply on their own and have no close relationship whatever with their faculty advisers. Many of them have a good relationship with the divisions of counseling, most of which are under the jurisdiction of men and women such as yourselves. Many of them have relationships with offices, deans of students, but it is distressing, most distressing, to hear a young man say, "Well, I just couldn't see my adviser, or he isn't interested in me," or, "The only time I see him is when he fills out my card at registration time."

There ought to be some premium placed on getting good faculty members, and I would say preferably young faculty members, the cream of the crop, involved in advising, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Next, more faculty members -- and once again, preferably younger faculty members -- need to be pressed into service to improve the understanding of the meaning of citizenship and responsibility among high school seniors, college freshmen and sophomores.

Our orientation programs, which luckily are beginning to stress the entrance of the student into the intellectual life of the campus, ought also to stress the meaning of responsibility in today's academic environment.

Next, there ought to be much more experimentation in the classroom. Faculty members need to learn to exercise their fine programs, their knowledge of program learning, teaching through television, independent student programs, the tutorial method, work study programs. Any kind of experimentation ought to be encouraged among faculties.

Now, what about the administration? Here is another baker's dozen of things to do in so far as administration is concerned.

First, I think presidents and other general officers of the university, including deans, should teach, not necessarily a full load every semester, (laughter) not even a half time load every semester. No one knows better than I how over-worked deans are, provosts and the presidents, but there is a good deal to be said, politically, psychologically and educationally, for the idea that from time to time, on occasion the president of an institution and his deans ought to make an appearance in the classroom as a teacher, a professor. It does not make much difference, really, whether it is a course in senior's honor course, which the president will introduce and close, to which distinguished faculty members will be brought, or whether it is a course a president or dean will teach on assignment within the department from time to time.

I am arguing simply that in order to repair communications, in order to strengthen the administrative relationship of the faculty members, that more presidents and deans should teach. It is a function that ought to be ennobled by the presence of the chief executive officer of an institution in the classroom.

Next, I believe that general administrations should have on the staff of the president what I should like to call an advocate of students. This would not necessarily be the dean of students, or vice president for student affairs, though conceivably one might exercise the role. Instead, it would be a person whose sole responsibility it would be to assess, evaluate, and bring the student viewpoint to every single major decision made by the administration, not having to take into account the many administrative considerations that all of you here are so burdened with in many activities under your jurisdiction, but an advocate of students, an advocate, if you please, in the sense that we know the word to be used in the courts, so that the students would feel represented in the councils of the administration.

Next, the administration should encourage younger people to come into administration and to college teaching. We are rapidly approaching the point, as I said earlier, when half the people of the United States are going to be under 25 years of age. That is just about five years away. The world of today and tomorrow belongs to the young man and woman who is today in his late teens, early twenties. These are the people that ought to be pressed into positions of executive responsibility.

Industry has recognized this, many of the new industries particularly. The Air Force recognized this, perhaps through the exigencies of war, but nevertheless

recognized it during World War II. In some measure the federal government is beginning to recognize this fact. But it is rather distressing that higher education, particularly in the administrative side, has not yet recognized this fact.

I think it would be very heartening if there were many more men and women in their mid and late twenties and early thirties pressed into top positions of administrative responsibility in our colleges and universities. If they can share in the executive responsibility in the federal government, if they can share in the legislative responsibility in our state houses and the congress, if they can share in the executive responsibility in the Department of Defense, and the major industries of the United States, certainly they ought to be able to share the executive leadership of our colleges and universities.

Yet look around the horizon in your region, in your states, and in your institutions, and make a list of the young men and women under thirty in top ranking or second ranking positions of executive responsibility. It is a very distressing fact, but I do not think we are all ready yet to face the world of 1970 with the kind of administrative leadership we have.

Administration also needs to reward good teaching with prestige and dollars and make the policy stick. It is distressing again -- and I do not mean to sound overly distressed this evening, but I am much more pessimistic now than I was two years ago at Evanston -- it is distressing to hear college presidents talk about the need to reward good teaching and then say, "How did you do it at your institution? How many dollars last year did you put into salary adjustments for the best teachers on your campus?" and then get silence as a response. It is these kinds of policies that we need to make stick and meaningful.

Next, I think administrations need to control research grants. I think the research tail has to stop wagging the teaching dog. I think that even if it means turning institutional priorities for a short time, on a temporary interim basis, upside down, a halt needs to be called on the proliferation of research to the neglect and impairment of teaching.

I buy Editor John Fischer's idea that every time an institution is offered a grant by industry, or every time an alumnus is tapped for another dollar, that alumnus or industry ought to say, "We are not going to give it for the new space laboratory," or "We are not going to give it for the new program to send your scholars abroad. We are going to give our money to the institution if you can show us that it is encouraging good teaching, that instruction has priority. Then we will give our dollars. Then we will give our grant."

Then I think more effort needs to be made, as is being done at many of your institutions, to tie in the academic and the student personnel areas. All of you know much more about this than I do. I think that everything you can do to encourage a fusion of the academic and student personnel service area, the better it will be.

Next, administrations ought to move to strengthen student government across the board. Students, you do know, are very sensitive and, by and large, very sharp. They can smell phonies a long way away. They can tell when something is for real and when it is not. We either ought to put real teeth and meaning into our student government organizations or we ought to dismantle them. Student government across the country ought to have a voice, I think, in educational policy discussions, as well as in other policy decisions.

The student, after all, is the consumer, and his parents -- and his parents are rather high paying consumers at that, these days -- and ought to have something to say about the quality of education, the kind of education that they are getting. Many students are beginning to feel this and to say this.

I think that the more we can involve student government in our educational policy decisions, the more we can put student representatives on senate and faculty curricular functions, the more meaningful our curriculum will become.

Then I think that externally administrations ought to step up their campaigns to acquaint the public with higher education, to acquaint all of our citizens with what goes on in colleges and universities, the full meaning of our institutional purposes.

As I said earlier, faculty members need to present a service to interpret higher education to the public in general. The public needs to know that we are encouraging on our campuses evaluation of teaching by faculty members, by department heads, and, yes, by students. There ought to be an encouragement in every type of institution of student evaluation for effective teaching.

Then, lastly, everything needs to be done to improve channels of communication. I know that that too, sounds like a hackneyed phrase in some respects, but let me read to you an excerpt from a private memo on Berkeley that was prepared shortly after the incidents of last fall by a distinguished educator who had been present on the campus, though he is not a member of the faculty or administration. He said:

"Finally, administrators cannot escape the realization that nothing whatsoever can be taken for granted. Student or staff grievances often inevitably have a way of

collecting and building up to a point where a sudden turn of circumstance can set off a surprising and demoralizing chain of events. Trustees, necessarily at some distance from the immediate problems of a campus, may find it difficult to deal with a rapidly escalating cycle of violation and reprisal.

"Vested with responsibility from the trustees on the one hand and the community on the other, administrators must absorb the greatest lesson of all from incidents at Berkeley. For administrators must examine their relationships with students and faculty, and these relationships must be re-evaluated, rather than assumed.

"Lines of authority and communication should be checked out rather than tested. Public relations loom more important than ever in view of the degree to which the public has been confused, not only by the occurrences at Berkeley, but by the administrative handling of the affair.

"What is true of student government and faculty government has been proven true of administration. Leadership is effective to the degree to which it is accepted by those led. Berkeley students rejected established leadership and created their own because, rightly or wrongly, they were persuaded that they were right and the university was wrong.

"The success of their actions has not escaped the notice of students throughout the nation with potential results that must not escape the notice of those who are charged with the administration of education."

Obviously we could add to this list of do's and don'ts on the part of faculty and administration and other lists, which I said earlier, for students, trustees and alumni, for the general public, must learn the real meaning of a university for our time.

I foresee the time in the not too distant future when the general public in an effort better to understand what goes on on our campuses, will begin to form citizens' committees on higher education, similar to the citizens' committee for the public schools formed in the late 1940's and 1950's. If these committees are formed, if the public begins to manifest its interest in higher education through this kind of collective inquiry, it is up to us, obviously, to welcome that inquiry and to see that it is channeled constructively.

By definition the university is a public institution, regardless of its manner of control. That is to say, as Woodrow Wilson said to the Princeton alumni in 1910, as he prepared to assume the governorship of New Jersey, "Nothing is private in the university; everything is public."

Our universities today, in the latter half of the century, are dedicated, whatever their form of government, to the common good and to the perpetuation of our heritage. In this context, and with this philosophy, it would seem appropriate to call on the distinguished leaders in the field of student personnel administration to express through your organization, particularly through your day-to-day activities on your respective campuses, your unswerving dedication to the needs of the young men and women it is our privilege to serve, for long before NASPA holds its 50th annual meeting, three years hence, today's college students will have taken their places as community leaders.

Where they marched and demonstrated today, there will surely be justice tomorrow. Where they speak out for decency and freedom and responsibility today, there will surely be a stronger community tomorrow.

If we spoil the enterprise of higher education today by inaction or weakness or shortsightedness, or a continuing erosion of its integrity, we weaken our country and the fabric of democracy tomorrow.

I know that all of you here are capable of meeting the challenge.

Once again, thank you for the privilege of visiting with you. [Prolonged applause]

PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Thank you very much, Larry, for that comprehensive, at times inspirational, and always illuminating address. I think you would be amazed to know how closely and how wonderfully it followed on the general theme of everything we did at this meeting and this Conference at this 47th Anniversary Conference, that what you said to us is a real wonderful, practical consequence of the work that we did the last two days, and for this we thank you most appreciatively. (Applause)

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am about to give the gavel to my more than worthy successor, and I do it with a mixture of three very deep and moving emotions which, though they differ one from another, are not necessarily contradictory. The first and very, believe me, deep emotion is one of relief. (Laughter) Thank God. (Laughter) We made it without ruining the organization.

The second is a little on the sentimental side, and it is an emotion of real and sincere regret. I regret that I will not be meeting with these hard-headed, cantankerous, rambunctious, irritating wonderful people on the Executive Committee.

My third and final, and I think this is the most over-powering of them all, is with a sense of real rejoicing

that I hand the gavel over to a man who is such a professional in his field that he will carry this organization forward competently and intelligently, Glen Nygreen.

... Applause as the gavel was presented to President Nygreen ...

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: To my colleagues in NASPA and friends, we have had a wonderful year of growth and development under the leadership of Father Vic. We are indebted to him for not only this year but the years he has given to help bring us to our present position, a position not only of achievement, but a position of opportunity, highlighted by the challenge given us by our speaker this evening.

I want to add the appreciation of the Executive Committee again to our retiring Conference Chairman, O. D. Roberts, and I want to add a very special word of thanks and appreciation to another person who is very frequently not given the public recognition that his very essential efforts deserve, and that is our Secretary-Treasurer Carl Knox. [Prolonged applause]

There was enacted this morning a restructuring of our executive arrangements in order that NASPA might carry out some of these functions, but somehow as I look at the task that faces this next Executive Committee, the work of Carl Knox becomes the single central revolving point upon which the success of this administration will certainly lie. I think Carl needs to know that we all recognize it, and that we take pride in our relationship with him.

A professional association is a strange and wonderful thing. Our annual conferences have not lost any of the feeling of warmth and fellowship which they had when we were much smaller. It has been a pleasure at this session to see many old friends, former members of the Association who have gone on to other responsibilities.

But this leadership problem which faces us is a problem which demands more than sacrifice. It demands a deep and personal commitment. Because of the problems of the restructuring, the present Executive Committee will, until this is implemented, continue with a series of responsibilities which are going to require the addition of a very large number of men in our profession to work at various and specific points.

I now announce that the Executive Committee will meet tomorrow morning for breakfast in the Dover Room at seven-thirty. We will meet until twelve o'clock noon. If anyone wants to come and see what we are doing, you are welcome. Until the election of the seven Regional Vice Presidents is accomplished, this will be an expanded and enlarged Executive Committee. Meeting with us, continuing to meet

with us, will be O. D. Roberts, and meeting with us will be Vice President William Perkins of the University of Santa Clara; Associate Dean Carl Anderson of Howard University; and Dean Willard W. Blaesser of the City College of New York.

The Executive Committee has invited, and he has accepted, Dean Joseph Kauffman, to accept a major responsibility in guiding the development of the new year of professional relations and legislation.

When we meet again, we will tell you the full story of our efforts. We hope it will have been successful.

To all of you for having made this a highly successful Conference, an invitation to all of you to let us know where you would like to go to work and what it is you would like to do. To all of you, a wish for a highly successful year ahead, and perhaps I should say, a peaceful conclusion to the current academic year. A safe trip home, on behalf of the Executive Committee of NASPA.

I now declare this 47th Anniversary Conference adjourned. (Applause)

... The Conference adjourned at ten o'clock ...

NASPA ANNUAL CONFERENCE DATES

1966	Seattle, Washington	June 26-29
1967	Cincinnati, Ohio	April 9-12
1968	Minneapolis, Minnesota	March 31-April 2
1969	Atlanta, Georgia	April (exact date to be announced)

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY March 31, 1964 - March 15, 1965

This brief report summarizes the activities of this Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs founded in 1919 since the 46th Annual Conference. It has been a year marked with change, growth and increased service.

Paid Institutional Memberships

Ten years ago (1955)	No. of member institutions	249
Five years ago (1960)	No. of member institutions	333
Last year (1964)	No. of member institutions	421
THIS YEAR (1965)	No. of member institutions	443

Individual Affiliations

<u>Category</u>	<u>No. as of March 15</u>	<u>(Added by March 24)</u>
Voting Delegates	443	(5)
Institutional Delegates	127	(11)
Associates	31	(3)
Student Affiliates	32	(1)
	633	(20)

Copies of the NASPA Roster dated March 15, 1965 denote new member institutions plus individual affiliates.

Publications

Proceedings of the 46th Anniversary Conference have been sent to conference registrants, voting delegates not in attendance, subscribing libraries, and to speakers. Orders for past Proceedings have been filled.

The NASPA Journal has had four issues. The success of this project (Dean Richard Siggelkow, Editor) would rate high on any rating scale. Plans are under way to produce an Index.

The "Directory of Student Personnel and Related Organizations in Colleges and Universities" by Commission I Chairman Don Winbigler, is, for the first time, completely out of supply.

College Student Personnel Work As A Career after distributing about 5,500 copies, should hold up until some decision is forthcoming on the COSPA project.

A Directory of National Student Organizations will be distributed at the 47th Anniversary Conference for trial and reaction purposes and some NASPA Monographs may be in the formulative stages from the productive work of current commissions.

The Executive Committee

Three meetings have been held and regular minutes are on file

for May 17 and 18, 1964, October 18 and 19, 1964, and for February 14 and 15, 1965.

Highlights of the May and October meetings were distributed to all NASPA Affiliates in early January by the Secretary.

It's been a working group with agreements and disagreements being fashioned towards the general weal of NASPA.

NASPA Representation

The Association has been represented at many national meetings such as the American Council on Education, the Association of Higher Education, the Council of Student Personnel Associations, the National Interfraternity Conference and H.E. & W.'s Mental Health Institute. Various inaugurations and educational functions have had representatives from NASPA.

Conclusion

All of us look forward to the findings of Commission VIII thanks to Chairman Ed Williamson, his crew and the Hazen Foundation. Changes in the pre-conference training are anticipated and Conference Chairman O. D. Roberts has gone all-out to provide variety and challenge.

Thanks are due to Mrs. Virginia Drake and to the secretaries of other personnel deans throughout the association who contribute so ably to NASPA.

Very sincerely yours,
Carl W. Knox
Secretary - NASPA

INTERIM TREASURER'S REPORT
MARCH 20, 1964 through MARCH 15, 1965
(Auditor's Statement Available after Fiscal Year)

BALANCE ON HAND MARCH 20, 1964 \$ 3,886.48

RECEIPTS

1964 Conference Receipts	\$ 9,427.57	
Dues Received	23,387.00	
Sale of Proceedings	142.00	
Miscellaneous Receipts		
(Journal, Directory		
and Case Books)	312.50	
Refund from 1963		
President's Fund	<u>87.70</u>	<u>33,356.77</u>
Total Receipts		\$37,243.25

DISBURSEMENTS

Conference Expenses

1964 Conference Expense	\$ 6,922.78
1964 Book Exhibit Pamphlet	416.00
1964 Proceedings	2,447.95
1965 Conference Expense	385.89
Conference Chairman Fund -	
1965 Conference	1,200.00
1965 Book Exhibit	25.00
1966 Conference	240.00
1968 Conference	93.50
1969 Conference	<u>110.80</u>

Total Conference Expenses \$11,841.92

Executive Committee Expenses

President's Fund	\$ 300.00
Executive Committee Expenses	5,922.88
Committee and Commission	
Expenses	<u>3,070.12</u>

Total Executive Committee Expenses 9,293.00

Secretary-Treasurer

Postage and Telephone	\$ 543.37
Stenographic Services	449.00
Printing and Mimeographing	377.68
Books	24.65
1964 Bonding of Treasurer	62.50
1965 Audit	<u>130.00</u>

Total Secretary-Treasurer's Expenses 1,587.20

Dues Expenses

American Council Dues	\$ 300.00
COSPA Dues	<u>50.00</u>

Total Dues Expenses 350.00

Journal 4,000.00

Directory 490.30

Miscellaneous Expenses 240.14

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS \$27,802.56 27,802.56

BALANCE ON HAND MARCH 15, 1965 \$ 9,440.69

APPENDIX B

1 9 6 5

COMMISSIONS and COMMITTEES (As taken from the Program)

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

(Made up of all Past Presidents in attendance, plus six members elected by the Association. The senior Past President serves as the Chairman.)

Past Presidents of the Association

Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin, 1919 (1),
1928 (10)
Dean W. E. Alderman, Miami University, 1936 (18)
President D. S. Lancaster, Longwood College, 1937 (19)
Vice President D. H. Gardner, University of Akron, 1938 (20),
1939 (21)
Vice President J. J. Thompson, St. Olaf College, 1951 (23)
Vice President J. H. Julian, University of South Dakota,
1944 (26)
Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas, 1947 (29)
Dean E. C. Cloyd, North Carolina State College, 1948 (30)
Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama, 1949 (31)
Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College, 1950 (32)
Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, 1951 (33)
President A. Blair Knapp, Denison University, 1952 (34)
President Victor F. Spathelf, Ferris State, 1953 (35)
Dean John H. Stibbs, Tulane University, 1955 (37)
Dean John E. Hocutt, University of Delaware, 1956 (38)
Secretary Frank C. Baldwin, Cornell University, 1957 (39)
Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon, 1958 (40)
Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois, 1959 (41)
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University, 1960 (42)
William S. Guthrie, Formerly Ohio State University, 1961 (43)
Secretary Fred J. Weaver, University of North Carolina,
1962 (44)
Dean J. C. Clevenger, Washington State University, 1936 (45)
Dean James C. McLeod, Northwestern University, 1964 (46)

Elected Members

John Blackburn, Dean of Men, University of Alabama
William G. Crafts, Dean of Men, University of Pittsburgh
John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College
Lawrence Riggs, Dean of Students, DePauw University
Robert H. Shaffer, Dean of Students, Indiana University
Frank J. Simes, Dean of Men, Penn State

CONTINUING COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Editor: Richard A. Siggelkow, Dean of Students, State
University of New York at Buffalo

Assistant

Editors: Ronald Barnes, Associate Dean of Students,
Iowa State University

Robert Crane, Assistant to Vice President for
Student Affairs, University of Illinois

Members of the Editorial Board:

Carl Anderson, Director of Student Activities,
Howard University

Burns Crookston, Dean of Students, Queens College

Thomas Emmet, Dean, McNichols Evening Division,
University of Detroit

Daryl Hagie, Dean of Students, Eastern Washington
State College

D. Whitney Halladay, Dean of Students, University
of Arkansas

Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men, University of Illinois

James R. Kreuzer, Acting Dean of Students,
Queens College

Ross R. Oglesby, Dean of Students, Florida State
University

Philip Price, Director of Student Activities, New
York University

Lawrence Riggs, Dean of Students, DePauw University

Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Director of Student
Personnel, St. Peter's College

Donald F. Young, Administrative Assistant for
Student Affairs, Sir George Williams Univ.

COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP AND REGIONAL MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATIVES

Chairman: John L. Blackburn, Dean of Men, University of
Alabama

Philip S. Ambrose, Dean of Students, New Mexico State Univ.

Bill Bichsel, S.J., Dean of Students, Gonzaga University

Victor C. Boe, Dean of Men, Concordia College

Channing M. Briggs, Dean of Students, Portland State College

William V. Burger, Dean of Students, Colorado School of Mines

Phillip R. Campbell, Dean of Students, Florida Southern Coll.

Richard B. Caple, Dean of Students, Northwestern State Coll.

L. E. Cooper, Dean of Men, University of South Carolina

John F. Courter, Dean of Students, Kansas Wesleyan University

James Dean, Dean of Students, Virginia Polytechnic Institute

James B. Ebert, Dean of Student Affairs, Pembroke State Coll.

Raymond O. Eddy, Director of Student Activities, Upsala Coll.

Edwin M. Gaines, Dean of Men, University of Arizona

Jerry Goddard, Dean of Men, Earlham College

George M. Guiley, Dean of Students, Ashland College
 Dean Ellis Guillony, McNeese State College
 Dean John J. Halloran, S.J., Creighton University
 W. O. Hampton, Dean of Student Personnel Services, Central
 Missouri State College
 R. E. Kinder, Dean of Men, University of Wyoming
 George F. Knerr, Dean of Student Personnel, Pace College
 Frank J. Krebs, Vice President for Student Affairs, Morris
 Harvey College
 Dean Dave Lawrence, University of Louisville
 Dean Daniel R. Leasure, North Dakota State University
 Don McDaniel, Dean of Men, Memphis State University
 Herbert McGibbeny, Dean of Students, Slippery Rock State Coll.
 Robert E. Miller, Administrative Assistant for Men's Affairs,
 University of Connecticut
 Robert Moore, Arkansas State College
 John T. Palmer, Dean of Students, San Verno Valley State
 College
 Donald F. Rankin, Dean of Students, Ferris State College
 James E. Robinson, Dean of Students, Northeastern University
 Daniel J. Sorrells, Dean of Students, University of Georgia
 James Stefl, Dean of Students, Iowa Wesleyan College
 Dean J. R. Switzer, University of Southern Mississippi
 Jorgen S. Thompson, Dean of Men, Augustana College
 Leslie H. Tucker, Dean of Students, Bradley University
 Jim Wilkinson, Dean of Men, Alabama College
 William D. Williams, Director of Student Personnel Services,
 Eastern Montana College
 William Yardley, Dean of Men, University of Houston
 Donald F. Young, Administrative Assistant for Student Affairs,
 Sir George Williams University
 Jack Yuthas, Vice President for Student Affairs, Wisconsin
 State College

COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP QUALIFICATIONS

Chairman: James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern
 University
 Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men, University of Illinois
 Kenneth R. Venderbush, Dean of Men, Lawrence College

AD HOC COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Chairman: Harry L. McCloskey, Dean of Students, Loyola
 University of Chicago
 Carl Anderson, Director of Student Activities, Howard Univ.
 Jack W. Graham, Dean of Students, Southern Illinois Univ.
 Thomas W. Hansmeier, Assistant Executive Dean, Kent State U.
 Edwin D. Heusinkveld, Dean of Men, Ferris State College
 G. Robert Ross, Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Affairs,
 University of Nebraska

Donald F. Young, Dean of Men, Loyola College of Montreal

Consultants:

Earle Koile, Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Texas

Philip Tripp, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Committee on
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PROGRAMS

Chairman: Willard W. Blaesser, Dean of Students, City College of New York

Committee on
NATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

Chairman: Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Hunter College

Committee on
RELATIONS TO COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL INSTITUTE

Chairman: Alan Johnson, Dean of Students, Univ. of Houston

Committee on
NASPA SECRETARIAT

Chairman: James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern University

John L. Blackburn, Dean of Men, University of Alabama
A. T. Brugger, Dean of Men, University of California at Los Angeles

Earle W. Clifford, Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University
Thomas A. Emmet, Dean, McNichols Evening Division, University of Detroit

Richard E. Hulet, Dean of Students, Illinois State University

STEARNS STUDY ON
STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Chairman: Philip Price, Director of Student Activities, New York University

Mark Barlow, Jr., Dean, Wesleyan University

O. W. Lacy, Professor of Psychology, Trinity College

James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern University

Ruth E. Warfel, Dean of Students, Mount Holyoke College

STRUCTURE OF NASPA

Chairman: Mark W. Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University

VOTING DELEGATE LISTINGS

Chairman: G. Robert Ross, Vice Chancellor and Dean of Student Affairs, University of Nebraska
Robert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University
Kenneth R. Venderbush, Dean of Men, Lawrence College

COMMISSIONS

Commission on PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS

Chairman: H. Donald Winbigler, Dean of Students, Stanford University
Donald K. Anderson, Dean of Students, University of Washington
Stanley C. Benz, Dean of Students, San Jose College
J. Gordon Brown, Dean of Men, Emory and Henry College
J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State University
Stanton Curtis, Dean of Men, Boston University
Thomas A. Emmet, Dean, McNichols Evening Division, University of Detroit
Carl M. Grip, Dean of Men, Temple University
J. Juan Reid, Dean of Men, Colorado College
Lawrence A. Riggs, Dean of Students, DePauw University
David W. Robinson, Dean of Students, Emory University
Mylin H. Ross, Dean of Men, Ohio State University
John H. Stibbs, Dean of Students, Tulane University
Wayne Tinkle, Dean of Men, Marquette University

Commission on LEGAL PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS

Chairman: John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College
Francis C. Bourbon, S.J., Dean of Men, Loyola University
Charles Gambs, Associate Dean, Ohio State University
David L. Harris, Dean of Men, Ripon College
William T. Hollingsworth, Dean of Men, Miami University
M. L. Huit, Dean of Men, State University of Iowa
James Scott, Assistant Dean of Men, Purdue University
Warner Wick, Dean of Students, University of Chicago

Commission on INSERVICE EDUCATION

Chairman: Richard Gross, Dean of Students, Wheaton College
Edgar Burks, Dean of Student Services, Louisiana State University at New Orleans
Alexander Cameron, Associate Dean of Students, University of Rochester
William Denman, Dean of Students, Elmhurst College
Elizabeth Greenleaf, Director of Counseling and Activities, Univ. Residence Halls, Indiana University

Ronald Jackson, Dean of Students, University of North Dakota
Arthur McCartan, Dean of Men, Washington State University
Osborn Parker, Co-ordinator, Student Development Program,
Southern Illinois University, Alton
William Swift, Dean of Men, Southern Methodist University
John Truitt, Dean of Students, Indiana State College

Commission on
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Thomas A. Emmet, Dean, McNichols Evening Division, University
of Detroit
Robert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University
Kenneth R. Venderbush, Dean of Men, Lawrence University

Commission on
STUDENT FINANCIAL AIDS

Chairman: William H. Knapp, Assistant Director, Division of
Student Personnel, Wayne State University
Donovan J. Allen, Director of Financial Aids, Indiana Univ.
Sam M. Basta, Dean of Students, University of Nevada
J. Gordon Brown, Dean of Men, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Jack B. Critchfield, Director of Admissions, University of
Pittsburgh
W. F. Griffith, Dean of Students, Colgate University
Carl M. Grip, (COSPA), Dean of Men, Temple University
Noble B. Hendrix, Dean of Students, University of Miami
Kingston Johns, Director of Financial Aids, North Carolina
State College
David E. Long, Dean of Students, McMurray College
George L. Playe, (COSPA), Dean of Undergraduate Students,
University of Chicago
Lyle J. Reynolds, Dean of Students, University of California,
Santa Barbara

Commission on
FRATERNITY RELATIONS

Chairman: Roland D. Patzer, Dean of Men, The University of
Vermont
East Core Chairman: Earle W. Clifford, Dean of Student
Affairs, Rutgers University
Hadley S. DePuy, Dean of Men, Franklin and Marshall College
Robert Keeseey, Dean of Students, University of New Hampshire
Edward C. McGuire, Dean of Students, University of
Rhode Island
Edward Pollock, Dean of Students, Union College and University
Marc Salisch, Director of Student Activities, Pace College
Charles E. Warwick, Assistant Dean of Men, Cornell University
Midwest Core Chairman: William R. Nester, Dean of Men,
University of Cincinnati

Thomas B. Dutton, Dean of Men, Ohio University
 John Feldkamp, Counselor for Fraternities, University of Michigan
 David L. Harris, Dean of Men, Ripon College
 Dudley Johnson, Counselor for Men, University of Akron
 William Lanier, Assistant Dean of Students, Wittenberg, Univ.
 Donald R. Mallett, Vice President and Executive Dean, Purdue University
 Ronald S. Stead, Dean of Men, Bowling Green State University

West Core Chairman: Arthur McCartan, Dean of Men,
 Washington State University
 Clifford J. Craven, Dean of Students, University of Oklahoma
 Donald M. DuShane, Dean of Students, University of Oregon
 Robert Gordon, Dean of Men, Stanford University
 Lyle Reynolds, Dean of Students, University of California
 Reginald D. Root, Dean of Men, University of Washington
 Arleigh Williams, Dean of Men, University of California

Southern Core Chairman: L. E. Cooper, Dean of Men, University of South Carolina
 Ben David, Dean of Men, University of Miami
 Calvin Mercer, Dean of Men, East Tennessee State College
 James Wilkinson, Dean of Men, Alabama College

Commission on EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Chairman: John W. Truitt, Dean of Students, Indiana State College
 Gary R. Anderson, Dean of Students, Eastern New Mexico State University
 Shelton L. Beatty, Dean of Men, Pomona College
 Howard J. Crosby, Associate Dean of Men, Rutgers University
 Thomas Dutton, Dean of Men, Ohio University
 Carl O. Eyke, Assistant Dean of Men, University of Vermont
 James E. Foy, Dean of Student Affairs, Auburn, University
 Charles L. Lewis, Executive Dean, Student Affairs, University of Tennessee
 Gilbert G. McDonald, Dean of Students, Northeastern University
 Eldon R. Nonnamaker, Associate Dean of Students, Michigan State University
 Keith L. Scott, Director of Men's Residence Halls, Illinois State University
 Ralph W. Wright, Dean of Men, Kansas State College of Pittsburg

STUDY COMMISSION ON STUDENT AND SOCIAL ISSUES

Chairman: E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students, University of Minnesota
 Donald K. Anderson, Dean of Students, Univ. of Washington
 Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., President, University of Connecticut

Armour J. Blackburn, Dean of Students, Howard University
Willard Blaesser, Dean of Students, City College of New York
Hugh Borton, President, Haverford College
Thomas Edwards, Dean of Students, Kenyon College
James R. Kreuzer, Dean of Students, Queens College
O. W. Lacy, Professor of Psychology, Trinity College
Daniel H. Pollitt, Professor of Law, University of
North Carolina
Patrick H. Ratterman, S. J., Dean of Men, Xavier University
Walter B. Rea, Dean of Students, University of Michigan
David W. Robinson, Dean of Students, Emory University
W. Dennis Shaul, Law School, Harvard University
Donald Stewart, Law School, University of Alabama
W. L. Swartzbaugh, Associate Dean, Amherst College
Helen White, Professor of English, University of Wisconsin

DIRECTORSHIPS

CONSULTING SERVICES

Chairman: Don Marsh, Assistant Dean of Students, Wayne State
University

NASPA PLACEMENT SERVICE

Chairman: Richard E. Hulet, Placement Officer, Illinois
State University

PRE-CONFERENCE SEMINAR

C. William Brown, Director, Assistant Dean of Men, Purdue
University
John Gillis, Dean of Men, Illinois State University
Carl Anderson, Associate Dean of Students, Howard University

NASPA CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Chairman: O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men, Purdue University
Assistant: Thomas A. Emmet, Dean, McNichols Evening Division,
University of Detroit

COUNCIL OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (COSPA) (IACC 1958-1963)

Chairman: Nelson M. Parkhurst, Registrar, Purdue University,
West Lafayette, Indiana,
Representing AACRAO

A coordinating council consisting presently of nine national
associations in the student personnel field with the primary
purpose being that of coordinating common interests by task
force approaches. Participating associations are:

1. American College Personnel Association
2. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
3. Association of College Admissions Counselors
4. Association of College Unions
5. Association of College and University Housing Officers
6. National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
7. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
8. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
9. College Placement Council, Inc.

Affiliate Member:
College Student Personnel Institute

NASPA Representatives are:

Elected Representatives:

- Term 1964-65 H. Don Winbigler, Dean of Students,
Stanford University
- Term 1964-66 Rev. Victor Yanitelli, S.J., Director of
Student Personnel, St. Peter's College
- Term 1964-67 Thomas A. Emmet, Dean, McNichols Evening
Division, University of Detroit

Ex-officio:

Jack C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State
University

1965 NASPA CONFERENCE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

- CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN - O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men, Purdue
University
- CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN DESIGNATE - Thomas A. Emmet, Dean of
McNichols Evening Division,
University of Detroit
- REGISTRATION CHAIRMAN - Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men, University
of Illinois, NASPA Secretary-Treasurer
- REGISTRATION SECRETARY - Mrs. Virginia Drake, University
of Illinois

LOCAL COMMITTEES ON ARRANGEMENTS

- CHAIRMAN - Dr. Armour J. Blackburn, Dean of Students,
Howard University
- EXHIBITS - James McPadden, Dean of Men, The Catholic
University of America
- HOSPITALITY FOR WIVES AND CHILDREN -
Mrs. Sue Shaw, American University
Dean Sue Olson, American University
- REGISTRATION -
Father L. P. Hurley, S.J., Georgetown University
Father John Devine, S.J., Georgetown University
Dean William Wright, Georgetown University
Dean Donald R. Buckner, Georgetown University

REGISTRATION FOR WIVES AND CHILDREN -

Dean Charles Van Way, American University

Dean Joseph W. Neale, American University

GENERAL HOSPITALITY -

Dr. Bernard Hodinko, University of Maryland

Dean Francis J. LeMire, Towson State College

BANQUET ENTERTAINMENT AND MEETING ROOMS -

Dean Paul Bissell, George Washington University

Dean Virginia R. Kirkbride, George Washington Univ.

LIAISON - Dean Carl E. Anderson, Howard University

PUBLIC RELATIONS-

Father Daniel E. Power, S.J., Georgetown University

GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS -

Dean Elizabeth Benson, Gallaudet College

Dean Richard M. Phillips, Gallaudet College

Dean Thomas Clayton, Gallaudet College

CONTRIBUTORS -

Father Frank C. Bourbon, S.J., Loyola College

Dean Pat Ruckel, Georgetown University

Father Edward A. Gray, S.J., Georgetown University

Dean Eugene C. Orth, Jr., The Catholic University
of America

Miss Barbara Bernhardt, The Catholic University of
America

GENERAL HOSTS (Howard University) -

Dean James L. Cary

Mr. James W. Hall

Mr. Walter Hawkins

Mrs. Beatrice Watson

Mrs. Goldie Claiborne

Mr. Benny J. Pugh

Mr. Charles H. Bush

Miss Marsha Van Cleve

RECEPTION COMMITTEE -

Mrs. Walter Hawkins, Chairman

AUDITORIUM COMMITTEE -

Dean James Cary, Chairman

LIAISON COMMITTEE - (for the purpose of looking after speakers and distinguished guests)

Mrs. Charles Bush, Chairman

DINNER COMMITTEE -

Mr. Benny Pugh, Chairman

Special thanks for valuable assistance to:

Sheraton-Park Hotel -

Mr. George Gorman, Director of Sales

Mr. Joseph Leathers, Reservation Manager

Mr. Norden Schwiebert, Maitre D'Hotel

PLACEMENT SERVICE - Woodley Room

Chairman - Richard E. Hulet, Dean of Students, Illinois
State University

EXHIBITS (Lower Concourse of States)

CHAIRMAN -

James McPadden, Dean of Men, The Catholic
University of America

Books arranged by Robert Crane and his associates

APPENDIX C

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

March 15, 1965

Adelphi Suffolk Coll.	*Robert K. Thomas	Oakdale, L.I., N.Y.
Adelphi University	*Roger A. Wingett	Garden City, N.Y.
Adrian College	Cody Meadows	Adrian, Michigan
Akron, Univ. of	*Richard L. Hansford	Akron, Ohio
Alabama College	James Wilkinson	Montevallo, Ala.
Alabama, Univ. of	*John Blackburn	University, Ala.
Alaska, Univ. of	*L. E. Haines	College, Alaska
Albion College	Morris R. Boucher, Jr.	Albion, Michigan
Alfred University	Paul F. Powers	Alfred, New York
Allegheny College	**John McKean	Meadville, Pa.
Alma College	**Fred W. Smith	Alma, Michigan
American International College	Charles R. Gadaire	Springfield, Mass.
American University	*Charles W. VanWay, Jr.	Washington, D. C.
Amherst College	*William L. Swartzbaugh	Amherst, Mass.
Anderson College	Norman Beard	Anderson, Indiana
Andrews University	Frank Knittel	Berrien Sprgs., Mich.
Arizona State Univ.	W. P. Shofstall	Tempe, Arizona
Arizona, Univ. of	*Edwin M. Gaines	Tucson, Arizona
Arkansas State Coll.	Robert Moore	State College, Ark.
Arkansas, Univ. of	D. Whitney Halladay	Fayetteville, Ark.
Ashland College	George M. Guiley	Ashland, Ohio
Auburn University	*James E. Foy	Auburn, Alabama
Augsburg College	*Peter H. Armacost	Minneapolis, Minn.
Augustana College	*Jorgen S. Thompson	Sioux Falls, S.D.
Baker University	Benjamin A. Gessner	Baldwin, Kansas
Baylor University	W. C. Perry	Waco, Texas
Baldwin-Wallace Coll.	Robert W. Pitcher	Berea, Ohio
Ball State Teachers College	*Merrill C. Beyerl	Muncie, Indiana
Bellarmino College	Hilary H. Gottbrath	Louisville, Ky.
Beloit College	*John P. Gwin	Beloit, Wisconsin
Berea College	*James Orwig	Berea, Kentucky
Berry College	*E. B. Hatcher	Mount Berry, Ga.
Bethany College	*Robert A. Sandercox	Bethany, West Va.
Boston College	*Edward J. Hanrahan, S.J.	Boston, Mass.
Boston University	Staton Curtis	Boston, Mass.
Bowdoin College	A. L. Greason, Jr.	Brunswick, Maine
Bowling Green State University	Donnal Smith	Bowling Green, Ohio
Bradley University	**Leslie H. Tucker	Peoria, Illinois
Brandeis University	Kermit C. Morrissey	Waltham, Mass.
Bridgeport, Univ. of	Alfred R. Wolff	Bridgeport, Conn.
Brigham Young Univ.	J. Elliot Cameron	Provo, Utah
Brown University	Donald E. Walsh	Providence, R. I.
Bucknell University	*John Hayward	Lewisburg, Pa.

*Denotes attendance at 1965 Conference

**Denotes wife also in attendance

Butler University	*Herbert Schwomeyer	Indianapolis, Ind.
California Institute of Technology	Paul C. Eaton	Pasadena, Calif.
California State Coll. at Hayward	Lyle Edmison	Hayward, Calif.
California State Polytechnic College	Everett M. Chandler	San Luis Obispo, California
California, Univ. of	Katherine Towle	Berkeley, Calif.
California, Univ. of	William C. Weir	Davis, California
California, Univ. of	*A. T. Brugger	Los Angeles, Calif.
California, Univ. of Santa Barbara Coll.	*Lyle G. Reynolds	Goleta, Calif.
California, Univ. of	*Charles J.A. Halberg, Jr.	Riverside, Calif.
California, Univ. of (Medical Center)	Frank M. Goyan	San Francisco, California
California Western University	William E. Clarke	San Diego, Calif.
Calvin College	**Philip R. Lucasse	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Canisius College	*Edward B. Gillen, S.J.	Buffalo, New York
Capital University	*John Kirker	Columbus, Ohio
Carleton College	Merrill E. Jarchow	Northfield, Minn.
Carnegie Institute of Technology	George Brown	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Carroll College	Robert E. Matson	Waukesha, Wis.
Carthage College	*John F. Courter	Kenosha, Wis.
Case Institute of Technology	*Thomas E. Baker	Cleveland, Ohio
Catholic University of America	**James J. McPadden	Washington, D.C.
Central Michigan U.	*C. Milton Pike	Mt. Pleasant, Mich.
Central Missouri State College	*W. O. Hampton	Warrensburg, Missouri
Central State College	*Charles H. Richmond	Edmond, Oklahoma
Chattanooga, Univ. of	**Robert C. Mildram	Chattanooga, Tenn.
Chicago, The Univ. of	*Warner A. Wick	Chicago, Illinois
Chico State College	Donald R. Gerth	Chico, California
Cincinnati, Univ. of	*William Nester	Cincinnati, Ohio
City College of N.Y.	*Willard W. Blaesser	New York, N. Y.
Clarkson College of Technology	*Henry E. McAdams	Potsdam, New York
Clemson University	*Walter T. Cox	Clemson, S.C.
Coe College	Warren Reinecke	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Colby College	*George T. Nickerson	Waterville, Maine
Colgate University	*William F. Griffith	Hamilton, New York
College of the Holy Cross	*Charles J. Dunn, S.J.	Worcester, Mass.
College of St. Mary of the Springs	*J. M. Cooney	Columbus, Ohio
Colorado College	*Juan Reid	Colorado Springs, Colorado
Colorado School of Mines		Golden, Colorado
Colorado State Coll.	Norman T. Oppelt	Greeley, Colorado

Colorado State Univ.	*Burns B. Crookston	Ft. Collins, Colo.
Colorado, Univ. of	Glenn Barnett	Boulder, Colorado
Columbia University in the City of New York	John Alexander	New York, N.Y.
Concordia College	Victor C. Boe	Moorhead, Minn.
Concordia Teachers College	Kenneth R. Schueler	River Forest, Ill.
Connecticut, Univ. of	**John Dunlop	Storrs, Conn.
Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art	*Richard S. Ball	Cooper Square, New York, N.Y.
Cornell College	Stuart J. E. Good	Mount Vernon, Iowa
Cornell University	Stanley W. Davis	Ithaca, New York
Creighton University	*John J. Halloran, S.J.	Omaha, Nebraska
Culver-Stockton Coll.	Byron W. Thorsen	Canton, Missouri
Dartmouth College	Thaddeus Seymour	Hanover, N. H.
Dayton, Univ. of	George Barrett, S.M.	Dayton, Ohio
Defiance College	*William Reynolds	Defiance, Ohio
Delaware, Univ. of	**John E. Hocutt	Newark, Delaware
Denison University	*Mark W. Smith	Granville, Ohio
Denver, Univ. of	*Dirke Brown	Denver, Colorado
DePaul University	T.J. Wangler, C.M.	Chicago, Illinois
DePauw University	*Lawrence A. Riggs	Greencastle, Ind.
Detroit Institute of Technology	*James S. Young	Detroit, Michigan
Detroit, Univ. of	*Francis A. Arlinghaus	Detroit, Michigan
Dickinson College	*Benjamin D. James	Carlisle, Pa.
Doane College	Robert Patterson	Crete, Nebraska
Dominican College	R. J. Feucht	Racine, Wisconsin
Drake University		Des Moines, Iowa
Drexel Institute of Technology	*William E. Toombs	Philadelphia, Pa.
Drury College	Randall W. Meyer, Jr.	Springfield, Mo.
Dubuque, Univ. of	*Lewis Furda	Dubuque, Iowa
Duke University	*Robert B. Cox	Durham, N. C.
Duquesne University	*Glenn M. Nelson	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Earlham College	*Eric G. Curtis	Richmond, Indiana
Eastern Illinois Univ.	Rudolph D. Anfinson	Charleston, Ill.
Eastern Michigan Coll.	William C. Lawrence	Ypsilanti, Michigan
Eastern Montana College of Education	*William D. Williams	Billings, Montana
Eastern Nazarene College	*A. Gordon Wetmore	Wollaston Park, Quincy, Mass.
Eastern New Mexico University	*Gary R. Anderson	Portales, N. Mex.
Eastern Washington State College	Daryl Hagie	Cheney, Washington
East Texas State Col.	*Harold F. Murphy	Commerce, Texas
Elmhurst College	*William F. Denman	Elmhurst, Illinois
Emory & Henry College		Emory, Virginia
Emory University	*David W. Robinson	Emory University, Ga.
Evansville College	Robt. V. Thompson	Evansville, Indiana

Fairfield University	*Joseph E. McCormick, Fairfield, Conn. S.J.	
Fairleigh Dickinson University	Clair W. Black	Rutherford, N. J.
Ferris State College	Donald F. Rankin	Big Rapids, Mich.
Fisk University	Reginald H. Hughes	Nashville, Tenn.
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical Univ.	*Warren Shirley	Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida Southern Coll.	*Philip R. Campbell	Lakeland, Florida
Florida State Univ.	**Harry P. Day	Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida, Univ. of	Lester L. Hale	Gainesville, Fla.
Fordham University	*Gerard Fagan, S.J.	New York, N. Y.
Fort Hays Kansas State College	Bill Jellison	Hays, Kansas
Francis T. Nichols State College	William L. Duncan	Thibodaux, La.
Franklin and Marshall College	*Hadley S. DePuy	Lancaster, Pa.
Fresno State College	Donald Albright	Fresno, Calif.
Gannon College	Louis Puscas	Erle, Pa.
General Beadle State College	*Harry P. Bowes	Madison, S. Dak.
General Motors Institute	*Robert S. Yoke	Flint, Michigan
Geneva College	Harold A. Bruce	Beaver Falls, Pa.
Georgetown Univ.	*John F. Devine, S.J.	Washington, D. C.
George Washington University	*Paul F. Bissell	Washington, D. C.
George Williams Coll.	*John W. Dubocq	Chicago, Illinois
Georgia Institute of Technology	James Dull	Atlanta, Georgia
Georgia State Coll.	Kenneth England	Atlanta, Georgia
Georgia, Univ. of	*Daniel J. Sorrells	Athens, Georgia
Gettysburg College	*John W. Shainline	Gettysburg, Pa.
Grove City College	Frederick Kring	Grove City, Pa.
Hamilton College	*Sidney Wertimer, Jr.	Clinton, New York
Hanover College	Glen L. Bonsett	Hanover, Indiana
Harpur College	John P. Belniak	Binghamton, N.Y.
Harvard University	John U. Munro	Cambridge, Mass.
Hastings College	*John W. Breckenridge	Hastings, Nebr.
Hawaii, Univ. of	*Harold Bitner	Honolulu, Hawaii
Heidelberg College	A. M. Thomas	Tiffin, Ohio
Henderson State Teachers College	Mrs. Lloyd P. Smith	Arkadelphia, Ark.
High Point College	C. J. Farmer	High Point, N.C.
Hiram College	**Charles Thompson	Hiram, Ohio
Hofstra University	*Randall W. Hoffman	Hempstead, N. Y.
Hope College	*James Harvey	Holland, Mich.
Houston, Univ. of	*William Yardley	Houston, Texas
Howard University	**A. J. Blackburn	Washington, D.C.
Humboldt State Coll.	Don W. Karshner	Arcata, Calif.
Hunter College in the Bronx	*Glen T. Nygreen	New York, N.Y.

Idaho State University	Mel F. Schubert	Pocatello, Idaho
Idaho, Univ. of	Charles O. Decker	Moscow, Idaho
Illinois Institute of Technology	Thomas E. Hogan	Chicago, Illinois
Illinois State Univ.	*Richard E. Hulet	Normal, Illinois
Illinois, Univ. of	Robert M. Crane	Chicago, Illinois
Illinois, Univ. of	**Fred H. Turner	Urbana, Illinois
Illinois Wesleyan U.	Donald B. Ruthenberg	Bloomington, Ill.
Indiana State College	*John W. Truitt	Terre Haute, Ind.
Indiana State College	*S. Trevor Hadley	Indiana, Pa.
Indiana University	*Robert Shaffer	Bloomington, Ind.
Iowa State Univ.	*Millard R. Kratochvil	Ames, Iowa
Iowa, University of	*Marion L. Huit	Iowa City, Iowa
Jamestown College	*Perry E. Gaalaas	Jamestown, N. D.
John B. Stetson Univ.	George W. Hood	DeLand, Florida
John Carroll Univ.	*James M. Lavin	Cleveland, Ohio
Kalamazoo College	*Paul E. Collins	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Kansas City, Univ. of	*Wheadon Bloch	Kansas City, Mo.
Kansas State College of Pittsburg	Ralph Wright	Pittsburg, Kansas
Kansas State Teachers College	R. W. Wygle	Emporia, Kansas
Kansas State Univ.	Chester E. Peters	Manhattan, Kansas
Kansas, Univ. of	*Laurence C. Woodruff	Lawrence, Kansas
Kansas Wesleyan Univ.	Aubrey Forrest	Salina, Kansas
Kent State Univ.	**Eric Rackham	Kent, Ohio
Kentucky, Univ. of	*Kenneth E. Harper	Lexington, Ky.
Kenyon College	*Thomas J. Edwards	Gambier, Ohio
Knox College	**Wilbur F. Pillsbury	Galesburg, Ill.
Lafayette College		Easton, Pa.
Lake Forest Coll.	*Howard Hoogesteger	Lake Forest, Ill.
Lamar College	D. L. Bost	Beaumont, Texas
Laval, Universite	Jean-Charles Bouffard	Quebec, Canada
Lawrence College	*Kenneth Venderbush	Appleton, Wisconsin
Lehigh University	*Charles Brennan	Bethlehem, Pa.
LeMoyne College	*John F. Blasi	Syracuse, New York
Lenoir Rhyne Coll.	**Robert L. Duncan	Hickory, N. C.
Lewis & Clark Coll.	Hester Turner	Portland, Oregon
Lock Haven State Coll.	*Edward H. Young	Lock Haven, Pa.
Long Beach State College	Karl A. Russell, Jr.	Long Beach, Calif.
Long Island Univ., Brooklyn Center	Calvin Crawford	Brooklyn, New York
Long Island Univ., C.W. Post College of	Fred S. DeMarr	Greenvale, N.Y.
Loras College	Eugene C. Kutsch	Dubuque, Iowa
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	S. X. Lewis	Ruston, Louisiana
Louisiana State Univ.	*Arden O. French	Baton Rouge, La.
Louisiana State Univ. in New Orleans	Edgar E. Burks	New Orleans, La.
Louisville, Univ. of	**Dave Lawrence	Louisville, Ky.

Loyola College	*Frank C. Bourbon, S.J.	Baltimore, Md.
Loyola University	*Harry McCloskey	Chicago, Illinois
Loyola University of	Richard W. Rolfs,	Los Angeles,
Los Angeles	S.J.	California
Loyola University of	William J. Junkin,	
New Orleans	S.J.	New Orleans, La.
Lycoming College	*Jack C. Buckle	Williamsport, Pa.
MacMurray College	*David E. Long	Jacksonville, Ill.
Maine, Univ. of	**John E. Stewart	Orono, Maine
Malone College	*Keith A. Bell	Canton, Ohio
Manhattan College	*George T. Eastment	New York, N. Y.
Mankato State Coll.	*Norbert K. Baumgard	Mankato, Minn.
Marietta College	Walter L. Hobba	Marietta, Ohio
Maritime College	Arthur J. Spring	Ft. Schuyler, N.Y.
Marquette University	*Wayne F. Tinkle	Milwaukee, Wis.
Marshall University	**John E. Shay, Jr.	Huntington, W.Va.
Maryknoll Seminary	Rev. John K. Halbert,	
	M.M.	Glen Ellyn, Ill.
Maryland, Univ. of	*Francis A. Gray, Jr.	College Park, Md.
Massachusetts Insti-		
tute of Technology	Kenneth Wadleigh	Cambridge, Mass.
Massachusetts, Univ. of	*William F. Field	Amherst, Mass.
McNeese State Coll.	*Ellis Guillory	Lake Charles, La.
Medical College of		
Virginia	*Franklin Bacon	Richmond, Va.
Memphis State Univ.	Edward D. McDaniel	Memphis, Tenn.
Mercer University	Helen Glenn	Macon, Georgia
Miami University	*Robert Etheridge	Oxford, Ohio
Miami, Univ. of	**Noble Hendrix	Coral Gables, Fla.
Michigan State U.	*Jack Fuzak	E. Lansing, Mich.
Michigan Technologi-		
cal University	*Harold Meese	Houghton, Mich.
Michigan, Univ. of	Richard A. Cutler	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Middlebury College	George Carey	Middlebury, Vt.
Midwestern Univ.	James Stewart	Wichita Falls, Tex.
Millikin University	**Byron L. Kerns	Decatur, Illinois
Minnesota, Univ. of -		
Duluth Branch	*C. W. Wood	Duluth, Minn.
Minnesota, Univ. of	*E. G. Williamson	Minneapolis, Minn.
Mississippi, Univ. of		University, Miss.
Missouri, Univ. of	*Jack Matthews	Columbia, Mo.
Missouri, Univ. of		
at Rolla		
Monmouth College	*Sam Burton	Rolla, Missouri
Monmouth College	*Elwood H. Ball	Monmouth, Ill.
	Thomas F. Murtha	W. Long Branch,
		N. J.
Montana State Coll.	Edward L. Hanson	Bozeman, Montana
Montana State Univ.	Andrew Cogswell	Missoula, Mont.
Montclair State Coll.	Lawton W. Blanton	Montclair, N.J.
Moravian College	Richmond Johnson	Bethlehem, Pa.
Morris Harvey Coll.	*Frank J. Krebs	Charleston, W.Va.
Muhlenberg College	*Claude Dierolf	Allentown, Pa.
Muskingum College	*John Leathers	New Concord, Ohio

Nasson College	**Robert D. Witherill	Springvale, Maine
Nebraska, Univ. of	G. Robert Ross	Lincoln, Nebraska
Nevada, Univ. of	Sam Basta	Reno, Nevada
Newark College of Engineering	**S. J. House	Newark, N.J.
New Hampshire, University of	*C. Robert Keeseey	Durham, N. H.
New Mexico Highlands University	*Ray A. Farmer	Las Vegas, N.M.
New Mexico State U.	*Philip S. Ambrose	University Park, New Mexico
New Mexico, Univ. of	Howard V. Mathany	Albuquerque, N.M.
New York University	*Phil Price	New York, N. Y.
North Carolina State of the Univ. of N.Car.	James J. Stewart, Jr.	Raleigh, N. C.
North Carolina, Univ. of	*C. O. Cathey	Chapel Hill, N.C.
North Dakota State University	*Daniel R. Leasure	Fargo, N.D.
North Dakota, The Univ. of	*Ronald Jackson	Grand Forks, N.D.
Northeast Louisiana State College	Fred J. Vogel	Monroe, Louisiana
Northeastern Univ.	*Gilbert MacDonald	Boston, Mass.
Northern Illinois U.	IErnest E. Hanson	DeKalb, Illinois
Northern Michigan U.	*Allan L. Niemi	Marquette, Mich.
Northern Montana Coll.		Havre, Montana
Northland College	*James R. Davies	Ashland, Wis.
Northwest Missouri State College	C. E. Koerble	Maryville, Mo.
Northwestern State College	*Richard B. Caple	Alva, Oklahoma
Northwestern Univ.	**James C. McLeod	Evanston, Ill.
Notre Dame, Univ. of	Charles McCarragher, C.S.C.	Notre Dame, Indiana
Oberlin College	**Bernard S. Adams	Oberlin, Ohio
Occidental College	Robert S. Ryf	Los Angeles, Cal.
Ohio State Univ.	*John T. Bonner, Jr.	Columbus, Ohio
Ohio University	**William Butler	Athens, Ohio
Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	**Ronald S. Stead	Delaware, Ohio
Oklahoma Baptist U.	Donald G. Osborn	Shawnee, Okla.
Oklahoma State Univ.	F. E. McFarland	Stillwater, Okla.
Oklahoma, Univ. of	Wm. Rex Brown	Norman, Oklahoma
Omaha, Univ. of	*Don J. Pflasterer	Omaha, Nebraska
Oregon State Coll.	Robert Chick	Corvallis, Oregon
Oregon, Univ. of	*Don M. DuShane	Eugene, Oregon
Ottawa, Univ. of	*Jean G. Archambault	Ottawa, Canada
Pace College	*George F. Knerr	New York, N. Y.
Pacific, Univ. of	Charles Trombley	Forest Grove, Ore.
Pacific, Univ. of the	Edward S. Betz	Stockton, Calif.
Pembroke State Coll.	*James B. Ebert	Pembroke, N.C.
Pennsylvania State U.	*Frank Simes	University Park, Pa.
Pennsylvania, Univ. of		Philadelphia, Pa.

Pepperdine College	Jennings Davis, Jr.	Los Angeles, Cal.
Pittsburgh, Univ. of	*William B. Crafts	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Henry Q. Middendorf	Brooklyn, New York
Pomona College	*Shelton L. Beatty	Claremont, Calif.
Portland State Coll.	*Channing Briggs	Portland, Oregon
Princeton University	*William Lippincott	Princeton, N.J.
Principia, The	*Allen C. Brooks	Elsah, Illinois
Purdue University	**O.D. Roberts	Lafayette, Ind.
Queens College	*James R. Kreuzer	Flushing, N. Y.
Quincy College	*Mel Doyle, O.F.M.	Quincy, Illinois
Redlands, Univ. of	*Robert C. Goodridge	Redlands, Calif.
Regis College	*Thomas F. Finucane, Rev.	Denver, Colorado
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	*Ira Harros	Troy, New York
Rhode Island, Univ. of	*Edward C. McGuire	Kingston, R. I.
Rice University	*Sanford W. Higginbotham	Houston, Tex.
Richmond Professional Institute (College of William and Mary)	*Richard E. MacDougall	Richmond, Virginia
Richmond, Univ. of	C. J. Gray	Richmond, Virginia
Rider College	Gilbert M. Banker	Trenton, N. J.
Ripon College	*David L. Harris	Ripon, Wis.
Roanoke College	*Donald M. Sutton	Salem, Virginia
Rochester Institute of Technology	*James B. Campbell	Rochester, N. Y.
Rochester, Univ. of	*Joseph Cole	Rochester, N. Y.
Rockford College	Stanley J. Gross	Rockford, Ill.
Rollins College	*Fred W. Hicks	Winter Park, Fla.
Roosevelt University	*Arthur E. Hoover	Chicago, Illinois
Rutgers - The State University	*Earle W. Clifford	New Brunswick, New Jersey
Sacramento State College	Donald Bailey	Sacramento, Cal.
St. Cloud State Coll.	Dale Patton	St. Cloud, Minn.
St. Joseph's College	Joseph M. Geib, S.J.	Philadelphia, Pa.
St. Lawrence Univ.	Herman L. Kirkpatrick	Canton, N. Y.
St. Louis University	Thomas F. McQuenny, S. J.	St. Louis, Mo.
St. Mary's College	Brother J. Francis, F.S.C.	Winona, Minn.
St. Olaf College	*Mark Almlı	Northfield, Minn.
St. Peter's College	*Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.	Jersey City, N.J.
St. Procopius Coll.	Valentine Skluzacak, O.S.B.	Lisle, Illinois
San Diego State Coll.	Herbert C. Peiffer, Jr.	San Diego, California
San Fernando Valley State College	**John T. Palmer	Northridge, California
San Francisco State College	*Ferd Reddell	San Francisco, California

San Francisco, University of San Jose State Coll. Santa Clara, Univ. of Scranton, Univ. of Seattle University	John LoSchiavo, S.J. *Stanley Benz Jerald McGrath *Henry Butler, S.J. Robert J. Rebhahn, S.J.	San Francisco, California San Jose, Calif. Santa Clara, Cal. Scranton, Pa. Seattle, Wash.
Shepherd College	Raymond O. Waldkoetter	Shepherdstown, West Virginia
Shimer College	Esther Weinstein	Mt. Carroll, Ill.
Shippensburg State College	John Hubley	Shippensburg, Pennsylvania
Simpson College	Dr. Waller B. Wiser	Indianola, Iowa
Sir George Williams U.	Magnus Flynn	Montreal, Canada
Slippery Rock State College	Herbert G. McGibbeny	Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
South Carolina, University of	*Charles H. Witten	Columbia, S. C.
South Dakota, State University of	**Howard Connors	Vermillion, S.D.
Southeast Missouri State College	*David A. Strand	Cape Girardeau, Missouri
Southeastern Louisiana College	*L. E. Chandler	Hammond, La.
Southern California, University of	Paul A. Bloland	Los Angeles, California
Southern Illinois U.	*Jack W. Graham	Carbondale, Ill.
Southern Illinois U.	Howard Davis	Edwardsville, Ill.
Southern Methodist U.	*William D. Swift	Dallas, Texas
Southern Mississippi, University of	J. R. Switzer	Hattiesburg, Mississippi
Southwestern Louisiana, University of	E. Glynn Abel	Lafayette, La.
Spring Arbor College	*James L. Chapman	Spring Arbor, Mich.
Springfield College	*Paul Congdon	Springfield, Mass.
Spring Hill College	*Hilton Rivet, S.J.	Spring Hill, Ala.
Stanford University	H. Donald Winbigler	Stanford, Calif.
State University of New York	*Richard Siggelkow	Buffalo, New York
State University of New York	*Stanley Metzger	Cortland, N. Y.
State University of New York	*F. Thomas Sheeder	Fredonia, N. Y.
State University of New York	Gerald Saddlemire	Geneseo, N. Y.
State University of New York	Robert W. Rock	Oswego, New York
State University of New York	*W. C. Flynt	Plattsburg, New York
State University of New York	Dean of Men	Stony Brook, N.Y.
Steubenville, Coll. of	*Dennis Sullivan, T.O.R.	Steubenville, Ohio
Stevens Institute of Technology	*William Bingham	Hoboken, N. J.

Susquehanna Univ. Syracuse University	*Tam Polson John S. Hafer	Selinsgrove, Pa. Syracuse, New York
Tarkio College	Thomas W. Carver	Tarkio, Missouri
Taylor University	Henry Nelson	Upland, Indiana
Temple University	*Carl M. Grip	Philadelphia, Pa.
Tennessee A. and I. State University	*J. A. Payne, Jr. Charles L. Lewis	Nashville, Tenn. Knoxville, Tenn.
Tennessee, Univ. of		
Tennessee Wesleyan College	*Floyd Bowling	Athens, Tennessee
Texas A & M Univ.	*James Hannigan	College Station, Texas
Texas Christian Univ.	Laurence C. Smith	Ft. Worth, Texas
Texas Technological College	**James G. Allen	Lubbock, Texas
Texas, University of	Jack Holland	Austin, Texas
Thiel College	*Roy A. Moss	Greenville, Pa.
Toledo, Univ. of	Donald S. Parks	Toledo, Ohio
Trenton State Coll.	Wilton Pruitt	Trenton, N. J.
Trinity College	F. Gardiner F. Bridge	Hartford, Conn.
Trinity University	J. C. Pool	San Antonio, Texas
Tufts University	Clifton W. Emery	Medford, Mass.
Tulane University	John H. Stibbs	New Orleans, La.
Tulsa, Univ. of	**H. N. Carter	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Tuskegee Institute	P. B. Phillips	Tuskegee Institute, Alabama
Union College	*Edward Pollock	Schenectady, N.Y.
Upsala College	Raymond O. Eddy	East Orange, N.J.
Utah, Univ. of	Neal A. Maxwell	Salt Lake City, Ut.
Valparaiso University	Luther Koepke	Valparaiso, Ind.
Vanderbilt University	Sidney F. Boutwell	Nashville, Tenn.
Vermont, Univ. of	*Roland D. Patzer	Burlington, Vt.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	*James W. Dean	Blacksburg, Va.
Virginia, Univ. of	B. F. D. Runk	Charlottesville, Virginia
Wabash College	Norman C. Moore	Crawfordsville, Indiana
Wagner College	John Hruby	Grymes Hill, Sta- ten Island, N.Y.
Washburn University of Topeka	*Ray B. Loeschner	Topeka, Kansas
Washington & Jefferson College	*Frederick J. Frank	Washington, Pa.
Washington & Lee U.	*Edward C. Atwood, Jr.	Lexington, Va.
Washington College	*Warren Brewer, Jr.	Chestertown, Md.
Washington State U.	*J. E. Clevenger	Pullman, Wash.
Washington Univ.	*Arno Haack	St. Louis, Missouri
Washington, Univ. of	*Donald K. Anderson	Seattle, Wash.
Waterloo, Univ. of	C. C. Brodeur	Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Wayland Baptist College	*Maurice J. Sharp	Plainview, Texas
Wayne State Univ.	**Harold Stewart	Detroit, Michigan
Wesleyan University	*Mark Barlow, Jr.	Middletown, Conn.
West Chester State College		West Chester, Pa.
Western Illinois U.	*G. R. Schwartz	Macomb, Illinois
Western Maryland College		Westminster, Maryland
Western Michigan U.	*James E. Robinson	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Western Reserve Univ.	**Paul L. Griffeth	Cleveland, Ohio
Western Washington State College	Russell A. Griffin	
Westminster College	M. S. Kuder	Bellingham, Wash.
Westminster College	*John E. Marshall	Fulton, Missouri
West Virginia Institute of Technology	*William H. Hassler	New Wilmington, Pa.
West Virginia Univ.	*Neil Balsi	Montgomery, W.Va.
West Virginia Wesleyan College	Joseph C. Gluck	Morgantown, W.Va.
Wheaton College	*R. A. Cunningham	Buckhannon, West Virginia
Wheeling College	*Richard Gross	Wheaton, Ill.
	William K. McGroarty, S.J.	Wheeling, W. Va.
Whitworth College	*Robert L. McCleery	Spokane, Wash.
Wichita State Univ.	J. Robert Berg	Wichita, Kansas
Willamette University	*Walter S. Blake, Jr.	Salem, Oregon
William and Mary, College of	Carson Barnes, Jr.	Williamsburg, Va.
Wilmington College	*Ross Ekstrom	Wilmington, Ohio
Windsor, Univ. of	Herbert Wilshire	Windsor, Ontario, Canada
Wisconsin State University		
Wisconsin, Univ. of	*Ormsby L. Harry	Eau Clair, Wis.
Wisconsin, Univ. of	*Joseph F. Kauffman	Madison, Wis.
Wittenberg University	Robert E. Norris	Milwaukee, Wis.
Wooster, College of	*Robert Long	Springfield, Ohio
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Ralph A. Young	Wooster, Ohio
Wyoming, Univ. of	*Martin C. Van de Visse	Worcester, Mass.
	*R. E. Kinder	Laramie, Wyoming
Xavier University	*R. H. Ratterman, S.J.	Cincinnati, Ohio

*Denotes attendance at 1965 Conference

**Denotes wife also in attendance

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

Abernethy, Bradford S.
116 College Avenue
New Brunswick, New Jersey

*Boxhill, Carlton J.
453 Lynn Street
Staten Island, New Jersey

Adams, Donald
Director
Division of Residence Programs
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

*Brown, C. William
Assistant Dean of Men
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

*Ahrens, Nyla Mrs.
Counselor for Students
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York 21, New York

*Bryson, Fred
Dean of Student Life
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

*Allen, Donovan Jay
Assistant Dean of Students &
Director of Scholarships &
Financial Aids Office
Indiana University
205 Maxwell Hall
Bloomington, Indiana

*Bunn, Peter
Assistant to the Dean
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

**Bush, Charles
Supervisor - Off-Campus Housing
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

**Anderson, Carl E., Director
of Student Activities
Howard University
Washington 1, D. C.

*Byron, Thomas
Associate Dean of Students
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Atkinson, Byron H.
Dean of Students
University of California
Los Angeles, California

*Cameron, Alexander R.
Dean of Students
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

*Baumhoff, Walter H.
Dean of Students
St. Lawrence University
Canton, New York

Cary, James L.
Associate Dean of Students
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

**Beer, Ronald
Dean of Men
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

*Caulk, Richard A.
Director of Chautauqua Hall
State University College
Fredonia, New York

*Box, Larry E., Assistant to
the Dean of Students
American International Coll.
Springfield, Massachusetts

Chambers, Glen A.
Head Resident
Southeast Missouri State Coll.
Cape Girardeau, Missouri

*Bowman, V. J., Dr.
Dean of Men
Kansas State Teachers Coll.
Emporia, Kansas

*Cooper, L. Eugene
Dean of Men
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

Critchfield, Jack B. University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Elsay, R. W. Assistant to the Dean of Men Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana
*Crosby, Howard J. Livingston Rutgers University Campus New Brunswick, New Jersey	*Emmet, Thomas A. University of Detroit Detroit, Michigan
Cummins, Emery Associate Dean of Students Wheaton College Wheaton, Illinois	Ewalt, Robert E. Assistant Dean of Men Washington State University Pullman, Washington
Curtis, Kenneth L., Jr. Assistant Dean of Men Northern Illinois University DeKalb, Illinois	**Fox, James Director of Student Activities Kent State University Kent, Ohio
Darrow, Carroll L. Assistant Dean of Men University of California Los Angeles, California	Gage, Lawrence Head Resident Wittenberg University Springfield, Ohio
*David, Ben Dean of Men University of Miami Coral Gables, Florida	Galloway, William B. Director of Admissions Adelphi University Garden City, New York
*Di Gerlando, I. Michael Assistant Coordinator Student Activities State University of New York 225 Norton Hall Buffalo, New York	*Gallarelli, George, S.J., Rev. Director of Resident Students Fairfield University Fairfield, Connecticut
Dolan, Anne Dean of Women University of San Francisco San Francisco, California	Galvin, James M., C.M., Rev. Dean of Men DePaul University Lincoln Park Campus 2328 Kenmore Avenue Chicago, Illinois
*Donoghue, M. Joseph University of Detroit Detroit, Michigan	Gildseth, Bruce Assistant to the Dean of Students Augsburg College 720 14th Avenue South East Minneapolis, Minnesota
Dorais, Richard University of Detroit Detroit, Michigan	**Gillis, John W., Dr. Dean of Men Illinois State University Normal, Illinois
Eichhorn, Oscar J., Jr. Assistant Dean of Students University of Denver Columbine East Denver, Colorado	

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

- | | |
|---|---|
| Greenleaf, Elizabeth A.
Assistant Dean of Students
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana | *Hibbard, George
Associate Director
Division of Student Activities
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan |
| Grier, D. J.
Assistant Dean of Men
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana | Holley, Jerald F.
Registrar
California State Polytechnic
College
San Luis Obispo, California |
| Gruber, James
Assistant Director, Norton
Hall
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York | *Hull, Thomas G.
Dean of Men
Univ. of Southern California
Los Angeles, California |
| Haenle, Thomas F.
Associate Director
State University of New York
225 Norton Hall
3435 Main Street
Buffalo, New York | Husa, Harold E.
Dean of Men
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois |
| *Halgazian, Berjoohy
Assistant to the Dean of
Students
Rutgers College of South Jersey
Camden, New Jersey | Jensen, Jerry C.
Assistant Dean of Students
University of Denver
Columbine East
Denver, Colorado |
| *Hansmeier, Thomas W.
Assistant Executive Dean
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio | *Johnston, Russell A.
Dean of Students
Richmond Professional Insti-
tute
901 West Franklin Street
Richmond, Virginia |
| *Heldeman, E. Richard
Counselor for Students
Hunter College
Bedford Park Blvd. West
Bronx 68, New York | Joiner, William
Ass't. Director of Housing
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island |
| Herrick, Marvin W.
Assistant to Dean of Students
University of Rochester
Morey Hall 308
Rochester, New York | *Jones, Burton L., Director
Presidential Units
University of Alabama
University, Alabama |
| *Heusinkveld, Edwin D.
Assistant Dean of Students
Ferris State College
Big Rapids, Michigan | *Kaufman, Harold
Financial Aids Counselor
Hunter, College
Bedford Park Blvd., West
Bronx 68, New York |

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

Kirkbride, Virginia
Dean of Women
George Washington Univ.
Washington, D. C.

Mallett, Donald R.
Vice President & Exec. Dean
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

*Knapp, William H., Director
Div'n. of Student Personnel
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

*Marsh, J. Don
Assistant Dean of Students
Wayne State University
Detroit 2, Michigan

**Knox, Carl W.
Dean of Men
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Mason, George
Placement & Financial Aid
Officer
Adelphi University
Garden City, New York

*Kurey, Joseph
Dean of Men
Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia

*Mazuzan, George T.
Ass't. to the Dean of Men
The University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

*Lanier, William J.
Associate Dean of Students
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio

McBriarty, Charles A.
Assistant Dean of Men
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Laughlin, Virginia Mrs.
Counselor for Stu. Activities
Hunter College
Bedford Park Blvd., West
Bronx 68, New York

McCartan, Arthur E.
Dean of Men
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

*Leafgren, Frederick
Dean of Men
Slippery Rock State College
Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

*McCay, Wilton Thomas, Jr.
Assistant Dean of Students
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Ledbetter, Carl S.
Dean of Men
University of Redlands
Redlands, California

*McClure, Charles T.
Assistant Dean of Students
University of California
Los Angeles, California

*Leemon, Thomas
Assistant Dean
Colgate University
Hamilton, New York

*McDonald, Keith H., Dr.
Administrative Student Dean
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

*Leveille, David, Counselor
Eastern Michigan University
Dean of Students Office
Ypsilanti, Michigan

McGinnis, Benjamin
Director of Student
Financial Aids
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

MacDougall, Peter R.
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, R. I.

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

*Meade, Roger
Head Resident
Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio

Meling, Galen R.
Director of Student
Activities
MacMurray College
Jacksonville, Illinois

*Meyn, Charles A.
Dean of Men
Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

**Minton, W. Stewart
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Mott, Harry
Director of Housing
The University of Missouri
at Rolla
Rolla, Missouri .

**Moyer, Alan Keith
Coordinator of Housing
Southern Illinois University
Edwardsville, Illinois

Mulligan, Michael V.
Assistant Dean of Students
The Georgia Institute of
Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

Munger, David E.
Director of Men's Housing
Albion College
Albion, Michigan

Nahas, Russell
Director of Orientation
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

*Nair, Donald A.
Dean of Men
Canisius College of Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

*Newman, James B.
Ass't. to Dean of Students
University of Chicago
5801 Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

*Nicholson, Darline
Dean of Women
Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia

Noordam, David
Assistant to the Dean of Men
University of Alabama
University, Alabama

North, Gary
Ass't to Dean of Students
Morehead State College
Morehead, Kentucky

Ogdon, Allen E.
Ass't. in Student Personnel
Eastern Washington State Coll.
Cheney, Washington

*Parker, Osborne B.
Coordinator of Student Affairs
Southern Illinois University
Edwardsville, Illinois

Pawa, Irving
19 Schmitt Road
West Orange, New Jersey

*Pease, N. Ronald
Dean of Men
Dickinson College
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

*Peters, David, Associate
Director of Residence Halls
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

*Phelps, Fred D.
Ass't. to the Dean of Students
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

*Playe, George L.
Dean of Undergraduate Students
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

- | | |
|--|--|
| Putman, Ivan, Jr.
Dean of Students
State Univ. College at Fredonia
Fredonia, New York | Salowitz, Edward
Head Resident Advisor
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan |
| *Quigley, Donald
Head Resident, Buell Hall
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan | Sartor, Laurence C.
Coordinator of Student Activi-
ties & Director of Men's
Off-Campus Housing
State Univ. College at Fredonia
Fredonia, New York |
| Raleigh, Michael J.
Assistant Dean of Men
Univ. of Southern Calif.
University Park
Los Angeles, California | *Saurman, Kenneth P.
Dean of Men
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois |
| Rathbun, Eula W.
10 Suydam Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey | *Scott, H. H.
Assistant Dean of Men
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana |
| *Reddoch, James W.
Dean of Student Services
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana | Scott, Keith L., Dr.
Director Men's Residence Halls
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois |
| *Ritchie, Clinton M.
194 College Avenue
New Brunswick, New Jersey | *Shearer, Roderick C.
Counselor
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan |
| *Rodger, Allan W.
Dean of Men
Indiana State College
Terre Haute, Indiana | *Sidles, Craig W.
Dean of Men
Cornell College
Mt. Vernon, Iowa |
| *Rohr, Urban E.
Dean of Men
Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska | Skornicka, Joel
Ass't. Director, Stu. Activities
University of Wisconsin
514 Wisconsin Union
Madison, Wisconsin |
| *Rubottom, Richard R.
Vice President for Univ. Life
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas | Smith, Richard J., Dr.
Dir. of Stu. Financial Aid
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois |
| Ruch, Dr. Carl R.
23 Bernard Road
East Brunswick, New Jersey | *Stielstra, William, Director
Office of Student Loans
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana |
| *Rudy, Joel
Counselor for Student Activ.
Hunter College
Bedford Park Blvd., West
Bronx 68, New York | |

INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

- | | |
|---|--|
| *Sunderland, Robert A., S.J.
Rev., Dean of Men
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, California | Watson, P. David
Assistant Dean of Students
Southeast Missouri State Coll.
Cape Girardeau, Missouri |
| Sweet, LuFay Anderson, II
Assistant Dean of Students
Lake Forest College
Lake Forest, Illinois | *Webb, John R., Dr.
Acting Director of Student
Personnel Services
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas |
| Tamte, James A.
Assistant Dean of Men
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois | *Wells, Joseph P.
Head Resident
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island |
| *Taylor, Ralph L.
38 South Main Street
Cranbury, New Jersey | White, Mulvey, Vice President
Student & Alumni Affairs
Univ. of Southern California
Los Angeles, California |
| Taylor, Terence S.
Assistant Dean of Men
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio | *Wilder, James C., Director of
Ridgecrest Area Residence Halls
University of Alabama
University, Alabama |
| Thomas, James L.
Assistant Dean of Students
North Dakota State Univ.
Fargo, North Dakota | *Wilson, Richard I.
Associate Coordinator
State Univ. of New York
225 Norton Hall
Buffalo, New York |
| Tichenor, A. H.
Assistant Dean of Men
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana | Wiltsey, Robert G.
Ass't. Professor of Psychology
& Coordinator of Upperclass
Men's Housing
Lawrence University
Appleton, Wisconsin |
| Trumpe, Richard M., Dr.
Coordinator of Student Activ.
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois | |
| *Tyler, Robert
Counselor to Men
University of Alabama
University, Alabama | *Wright, William McKinley
Associate Dean of Students
DePauw University
Greencastle, Indiana |
| *Wallace, W. Jewell
Dean of Men
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas | Yocum, Janet E.
Douglas College, Gibbons N
New Brunswick, N. J. |
| | Zillman, Theodore W.
Ass't. to Vice President
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin |

ASSOCIATE

Anson, Jack L.
National Secretary
The Phi Kappa Tau Fraternity
Oxford, Ohio

Fagin, Margaret C.
Assoc. Dean of Housing & Activ.
Chico State College
Chico, California

Balciulis, Charles A.
Dean of Men
Northwestern University
Office of Dean of Students
Scott Hall
Evanston, Illinois

*Fentress, Duke
General Secretary
Zeta Psi Fraternity
125 East 50th Street
New York, New York

*Bringham, William T.
Executive Secretary
Sigma Chi Fraternity
2603 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois

*Fletcher, Richard R.
Executive Secretary
Sigma Nu Fraternity
Box 1869
Lexington, Virginia

*Burns, Ralph F.
Executive Secretary
Alpha Sigma Phi Fraternity
24 West William Street
Delaware, Ohio

Gratwick, Roger W.
Dean of Men
State University of New York
201 Harriman Library
Buffalo, New York

*Butler, W. A., Jr.
Delta Upsilon Fraternity, Inc.
271 Madison Avenue
New York, New York

*Heberling, Paul M.
Dean of Men, Juniata College
Huntingdon, Pennsylvania

Carberry, Rev. Basil, O.S.B.
Dean of Students
St. Anselm's College
Manchester, New Hampshire

*Henderson, G. Gordon, S.J.,
Rev.
Wheeling College
Wheeling, West Virginia

Coe, Maynard H.
Grand Secretary
Alpha Gamma Rho Fraternity
323 Cornell Avenue
Des Plaines, Illinois

**Johnson, Alan W.
Coll. Stu. Personnel Institute
10th and Dartmouth Streets
Claremont, California

Croake, Richard M.
Assistant Dean of Men
Northwestern University
Scott Hall
Evanston, Illinois

*Johnson, Donald M.
Executive Director
Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity
209 West Franklin Street
Richmond, Virginia

Dufft, James H., Jr.
Dir. of Residence Halls for Men
Upsala College
East Orange, New Jersey

Lafkiotes, C. James, Director
University Placement Services
State University of New York
Schoellkopf Hall-Basement
3435 Main Street
Buffalo, New York

ASSOCIATE

- LeClere, William E.
Executive Secretary
Chi Psi Fraternity
1705 Washtenaw Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan
- Melchert, Bruce W.
Executive Secretary
Tau Kappa Epsilon
3755 Washington Boulevard
Indianapolis, Indiana
- Miller, Carroll L., Dr.
Acting Dean, Graduate School
Howard University
Washington, D. C.
- *Miller, James
Resident Counselor,
Welch Residence Hall
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio
- Miller, Joe W.
Associate Dean of Students
Northwestern University
Scott Hall
Evanston, Illinois
- *Miller, Robert
Executive Secretary
Phi Delta Theta
Oxford, Ohio
- Nelson, Mildred I.
Director of Residence
Halls for Women
Upsala College
East Orange, New Jersey
- Owen, Durward
Executive Secretary
The Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity
Sumter, South Carolina
- Rhodes, Douglas W.
Assistant Dean of Men
Northwestern University
Scott Hall
Evanston, Illinois
- Siegel, Barry
Executive Secretary
Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York 1, New York
- *Smith, L. N., Advisor on
Foreign Student Affairs
State Univ. of New York
201 Harriman Library
Buffalo, New York
- *Smith, Rex A.
Eminent Supreme Recorder
Sigma Alpha Epsilon
1856 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois
- *Toll, George S.
Executive Secretary
Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity
6651 Enright Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri
- Watkins, Executive Director
The Pi Kappa Alpha Fraternity
577 University Boulevard
Memphis, Tennessee
- Wittich, John J.
Executive Director
College Student Personnel
Institute
10th and Darmouth Streets
Claremont, California
- *Zerman, William S.
Executive Secretary
Phi Gamma Delta
1757 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

STUDENT AFFILIATES

Andringa, Robert
Michigan State University
227 South Case
East Lansing, Michigan

Gohn, Lyle Alan
Office of Admissions
Executive Building
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Bacheller, John
Michigan State University
130 E. Akers Hall
East Lansing, Michigan

Gottschall, Ronald
Michigan State University
N. Wonders Hall
East Lansing, Michigan

*Bailey, Dallas
Office of the Dean of Men
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

*Hallenbeck, Daniel A.
Abbot Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Bartlett, David
Office of Student
Financial Aids
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Hanson, Alan
Coll. Student Personnel Program
135-10 Southern Hills
Carbondale, Illinois

Batista, Donald M.
32 East Broad Street
Mount Vernon, New York

*Heddleston, L. H.
Miami University
Dennison Hall
Oxford, Ohio

Baysore, Jerry
Head Resident
1901 East Iliff Avenue
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

*Hefke, Norman
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Brown, Lyle
Head Resident
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

*Kaplan, Jack, Head Counselor
101 Austin Hall
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

*Cargill, Don
University of Alabama
P. O. Box 807
University, Alabama

McClellan, Stephen
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

*Chesin, Sorrell
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Manges, R. J.
Office of the Dean of Men
Executive Building
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

**Englund, Thomas
Michigan State University
Abbott Hall
East Lansing, Michigan

Norton, Donald
Coll. Stu. Personnel Program
1003 West Schwartz
Carbondale, Illinois

STUDENT AFFILIATES

O'Donnell, S. Bruce Head Resident, Pioneer Hall University of Denver 2140 South Race, Apt. 415 Denver, Colorado	Smith, Patrick Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan
*Pappas, John Resident Counselor, Clark Hall Kent State University Kent, Ohio	Steele, Richard Head Resident The University of Vermont 101 Marsh Hall Burlington, Vermont
Pedersen, J. O. Office of the Dean of Men Purdue University Executive Building Lafayette, Indiana	*Swanda, John R., Jr. Assistant to Dean of Men University of Illinois 174 Weston Champaign, Illinois
*Peebles, James S., Jr. Staff Representative Sigma Phi Epsilon 209 West Franklin Street Richmond, Virginia	Swanson, Jerry Head Resident University of Illinois 102 Hopkins Champaign, Illinois
Pierce, Milo C. University of Illinois 182 Forbes Hall Champaign, Illinois	*Tombaugh, Richard Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan
*Riegel, Paul S. 185 Dante Avenue Tuckahoe, New York	Upcraft, M. Lee Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan
*Sandeem, C. Arthur Head Resident Advisor Michigan State University Wilson Hall East Lansing, Michigan	Wetzel, Ted R. 1003 West Schwartz Carbondale, Illinois
*Smith, Edwin Office of the Dean of Men Kent State University Kent, Ohio	

* Denotes attendance at 1965 Conference
 ** Denotes wife also in attendance

APPENDIX D

ATTENDANCE

FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

Individuals marked on Roster of Members (Appendix C) with an asterisk (*), plus the following:

Abbinanti, Andrew P.
Asst. Dean of Students
Farmingdale Agricultural &
Technical College
State Univ. of Farmingdale
Farmingdale, New York

Ahrens, Nyla J., Counselor
Hunter College
New York, New York

Allen, Neal E.
Head Resident
Bowling Green State Univ.
Bowling Green, Ohio

Ambler, David A.
Asst. Director, Residence
Halls Counseling & Activities
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Andrews, John E.
Dean of Men
Waynesburg College
Waynesburg, Pennsylvania

Antes, Richard L.
Residence Hall Counselor
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois

Antonelli, Patrick T.
Dormitory Director
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Appleton, James R., Associate
Director of Residence Hall
Programs
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Arbes, Bill Howard, Student
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Arrowsmith, Bobby G.
Asst. Head Counselor
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Austin, Neil L., Graduate Stu.
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Babb, Walter J.
Dean of Men
Wagner College
Staten Island, New York

Barnes, Ronald E.
Assoc. Dean of Students
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Barth, Robert E.
Wagner College
Staten Island, New York

Bates, Loyd A.
Dean of Students
Shepherd College
Shepherdstown, West Virginia

Bennion, Lowell L.
Assoc. Dean of Students
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Bernacki, John F.
Director Student Center
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Biever, Duane A., Head Resi-
dent Men's Res. Hall
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

Boyce, Madison L.
Asst. Dean of Students
State University of New York
Alfred, New York

Brames, Alfred F.
Residence Hall Director
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

Brandt, Robert George
Head Resident
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

Brennan, James
Assistant Dean of Students
American International College
Springfield, Massachusetts

Brooks, Robin
Dean of Students
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Brooks, Ronny L.
Dean of Men
Appalachian State Teachers
College
Boone, North Carolina

Brown, J. Gordon
Dean of Men
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia

Brown, John Mr., Jr.
Assoc. Dean of Students
Harpur College
Binghamton, New York

*Brown, Warren O.
University of Illinois
Chicago, Illinois

Bryan, M. Edward
Director of Housing
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Buckner, Donald R.
Asst. Director of Student
Personnel
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

Bumgardner, Douglas C.
Dean of Men
Morris Harvey College
Charleston, W. Virginia

Burchett, Charles R.
Asst. Dean of Students
Univ. of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Burke, Thomas F.
Assistant Dean of Men
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Burkhardt, William H., Jr.
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Burns, Robert E.
Graduate Assistant
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Bybee, Donald
Graduate Res. Adviser
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Campbell, Margaret A.
Counselor for Women
Auburn Community College
Auburn, New York

Carleton, Jim G.
Dean of Men
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Casebeer, Arthur L.
Dean of Students
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa

Cheney, L. William
Assistant Dean of Men
Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio

Cohen, Leon
Dean of Students
Borough of Manhattan Commu-
nity College
New York, New York

Cohen, Matthew A.
Counselor - Administrator
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Collier, Kenneth M.
Dean of Men
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Collins, Charles L.
Dean of Students
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio

Conners, Paul
Assistant to Dean of Men
Rutgers College
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Copeland, James L.
Assistant Dean of Men
Hanover College
Hanover, Indiana

Cornelius, Francis J.
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Cornell, William A.
Director of Students
Edinboro State College
Edinboro, Pennsylvania

Corologas, James C.
Dean of Men
Champlain College
Burlington, Vermont

Corson, Louis D., Warden
College of Church Musicians
Washington Cathedral
Washington, D. C.

Cramer, Philip Wayne
Field Secretary
Acacia National Fraternity
Evanston, Illinois

Daniel, Ralph D.
Executive Secretary
Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity
Cleveland, Ohio

Darrah, Thomas L.
Assistant Dean of Men
Carroll College
Waukesha, Wisconsin

Davis, W. E.
Administrative Assistant
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

Dawson, J. D., Vice President
and Dean of Students
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio

DeBruhl, Bruce
Assistant to the Dean of Men
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

*DeKoff, Irving
Assistant Dean
Columbia University
New York, New York

Delcamp, Sam
Manager of Housing Program
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

*Denning, Robert A.
Dean of Students
Ulster County Community College
Kingston, New York

DePonte, Dan
Director of Placement
Suffolk County Community Coll.
Selden, New York

Devlin, J. Stuart
Graduate Assistant
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Dobens, Frederick A.
Asst. to the Dean of Men
Rutgers College
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Dove, Hazel C.
Assistant Dean of Students
Dutchess Community College
Poughkeepsie, New York

Duncan, James P.
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Dunford, Ralph E.
Dean of Students
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dutton, Thomas B.
Dean of Men
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Dux, Henry A.
Dean of Students
Moorhead State College
Moorhead, Minnesota

Easterly, Frederick, Rev., C.M.
Vice President for Student
Personnel Services
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York

Eilenberg, Howard
Assistant Director -
Evening Div
Fashion Institute of Technology
New York, New York

Eldred, Donald R.
Dean of Students
Illinois College
Jacksonville, Illinois

Ellich, Rochelle
Counselor - Dean of Women
Niagara County Community Coll.
Niagara Falls, New York

Eustis, Pennell S.
Director of Student Activities
Clarkson College
Potsdam, New York

Eversen, Richard E.
Associate Dean of Men
Stevens Institute of Tech.
Hoboken, New Jersey

Eycke, Carl O.
Assistant Dean of Men
The University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

Farricker, W. J., S.J.
Dean of Men
Fordham University
New York, New York

Feldkamp, John C.
Asst. to the Vice President
for Student Affairs
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ferguson, Robert C.
Asst. Dean of Students
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Finnegan, Alan D.
Director of Admissions and
Student Personnel Services
Jefferson Community College

Fischer, Leonard
Graduate Student
State University of New York
Cortland, New York

Franks, Lawrence T.
Dean of Men
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Frost, Gary J.
Assistant to Dean College of
Arts & Sciences
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Fry, George S.
College of the School of the
Ozarks
Point Lookout, Missouri

Geary, Edward A., Rev., S.J.
Assistant Director of
Student Personnel
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

Geitner, Kathleen
Dean of Women
State University of New York
Morrisville, New York

Gennett, Nicholas D.
Student
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Gerace, Terence
Graduate Student
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York

Gersten, Robert S.
Dean of Students
Nassau Community College
Garden City, New York

Gigliotti, Ronald S.
Asst. Director of Admissions
Monroe Community College
Rochester, New York

Gilbert, Paul L.
Assistant Dean of Students
Kalamazoo College
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Ginsberg, Paul
Educational Advisor
Residence Halls
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

*Godard, Jerry H.
Dean of Men and Assistant
Professor Psychology
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

Goldsmith, William A.
Graduate Student
Teachers College, Columbia
New York, New York

Goolsby, Richard P.
Dean of Men
LeMoyne College
Syracuse, New York

Gordon, Robert G.
Dean of Men
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Greason, A. L., Jr.
Dean of Students
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine

Hachet, Ronald A.
Director of Student Activities
Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

Haefner, Donald A., Director
of Off-Campus Housing
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

*Hall, Jack B.
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Hamm, George F.
Dean of Men
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

*Hancock, Don, Dean of Men
Transylvania College
Lexington, Kentucky

*Hardy, Donald P.
Dean of Men
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Harlan, Ivan C.
Dean of Men
Knox College
Galesburg, Illinois

Harr, James B., Registrar
Dutchess Community College
Poughkeepsie, New York

Harris, James R.
Assistant Head Counselor
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Hassan, W. Richard
Instructor
Education and Psychology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Hawkins, Gerald G.
Assistant Director of Student
Activities
North Carolina State of
University of North Carolina
Raleigh, North Carolina

Hay, M. Thomas, Head Resident
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio

Heath, Roy
Dean of Students
Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

Hickerson, J. Douglas
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Hirsch, Edgar
Assistant Director Evening
Division
New York City Community Coll.
Brooklyn, New York

Hobbs, Walter L.
Dean of Men
Marietta College
Marietta, Ohio

Hector, Michael B.
Assistant Dean of Men
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois

Hodge, Floyd R.
Assistant Head Counselor
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Hodinko, Bernard
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Hohensee, James J.
Dean of Students
Erie County Technical
Institute
Buffalo, New York

Hollingsworth, William T.
Dean of Men
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Hopkins, Jack B.
Administrative Assistant
Sir George Williams University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Houston, Robert J.
Associate Dean of Students
Mohawk Valley Community Coll.
Utica, New York

Howell, Joe A.
Dean of Men
Emory and Henry College
Emory, Virginia

Hubbell, Robert N.
Counselor to Men
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Hurley, Lawrence, Rev., S.J.
Assistant Director of Student
Personnel
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

Iannoli, Joseph J.
Assistant to the Dean
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

*Iannotti, Gerald A.
Coordinator Humanities
Fulton-Montgomery Community
College
Johnstown, New York

Jackson, James B.
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Jenks, Dudley A.
Assistant to the Dean of Men
Drexel Institute of Technology
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Johnson, Dudley C.
Adviser of Men
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio

Jones, William
Guidance Director
Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Judge, Robert K., Rev., S.J.
Graduate Student
Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

Kammer, Roselyn
Assistant Dean of Students
American International College
Springfield, Massachusetts

Kappauf, Robert L.
Assistant Head Counselor
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Langston, Timothy L.
Head Counselor
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Keiser, Edward C.
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Larson, Robert W.
Financial Aid Officer
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio

Kennedy, Christopher F.
Dean of Freshmen
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts

Lauter, Charles F., Jr.
Asst. Dean for Students
Wesleyan University
Middletown, Connecticut

King, Howard D., Jr.
Assistant Dean of Men
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio

Lavin, Morgan L.
Dean of Men
John Carroll University
Cleveland, Ohio

Kirts, Donald K.
Dean of Men
Moravian College
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

LeMire, Francis J.
Assistant Dean of Students
Towson State College
Baltimore, Maryland

Kollintzas, George N.
Dean of Students
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York

Leshner, Martin
Staff Assistant
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Kramer, Fred
Dean of Students
Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota

Levesque, George A.
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Lacy, O. W.
Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

Lewis, Edward S.
Director Cooperative Education
Borough of Manhattan
Community College
New York, New York

LaFave, Francis E.
Hall Director
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Ind.

Liebert, Roland J.
Academic Affairs Director
U. S. National Student Assn.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Lambert, George F.
Dean of Men
State University College
Oswego, New York

Lignelli, Frank
Assistant Dean of Students
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania

Lane, Benjamin A.
Dean of Student Affairs
Behrend Campus of the
Pennsylvania State Univ.
Erie, Pennsylvania

Lockett, Jack, Assistant Dean
for Student Affairs
Lafayette College
Easton, Pennsylvania

Long, William G., Dean of Men
Univ. of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Loos, Frank M.
Dean of Students
Lincoln College
Lincoln, Illinois

*Loucks, Donald, Dean of Men
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Lucas, David C.
Residence Hall Director
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Lyons, James W.
Dean of Students
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania

MacLeod, C. T.
Dean of Students
Claremont Men's College
Claremont, California

MacNaughton, William S.
Director of Counseling
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

MacRae, James B.
Dean of Students
The Lincoln University
Lincoln University, Pa.

Mahoney, Arthur J.
Assistant Dean of Students
Rutgers
Newark, New Jersey

Makuen, Donald R.
Dean of Men
Hamline University
St. Paul, Minnesota

Mangus, Larry L.
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Marchildon, Gerald L.
Coordinator, Student Activ.
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey

Martin, Jere P.
Senior Residence Adviser
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Maxwell, Howard B.
Coordinator of Academic Ad-
visement
State University of New York
Albany, New York

McClain, Don, Assistant
Director - Housing
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York

McKinney, David L., Student
Harvard Graduate School of Bu
Business Administration
Boston, Massachusetts

McNamara, James F., Rev.C.S.Sp.
Vice President for Student Aff.
Duquesne University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Melody, Philip B.
Dean of Students
Quinsigamond Community College
Worcester, Massachusetts

*Meyer, Elmer, Jr.
Assistant Dean of Students
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Mikesell, Donald W.
Director, Howick Hall
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Miller, Theodore K., Assist-
ant Professor of Education
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York

Millett, Barry
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Maine
Orono, Maine

Miltenger, Larry J.
Res. Hall Director
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Mims, George L.
Assistant Placement Director
Hunter College in the Bronx
Bronx, New York

Minella, Phillip J.
Graduate Student
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Mitchell, L. Standlee
Dean of Men
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

Mitchell, Nan, Director of
Student Activities
Mercy College of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan

Moak, Franklin E.
Dean of Students
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi

Moler, Stephen H., Assistant
Director of Student Activ.
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

Monticello, Ralph R.
Assistant to Dean of Men
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Moore, Donald R.
Director of Housing
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Morris, Robert B.
Associate Dean of Students
State University of New York
Albany, New York

Moy, James, Assistant
Dean of Students
Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota

Mumpower, Joseph C.
Director - Residence Hall
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Murphy, James Thomas
Asst. to Dean of Students
Nassau Community College
Garden City, New York

Murphy, Raymond
Assistant Dean of Men
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Murrin, Thomas L.
Graduate Resident Advisor
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

*Naeseth, Erling
Dean of Students
Luther College
Decorah, Iowa

Neale, Joseph W., Dean of Men
The American University
Washington, D. C.

Nelson, Marvin O., Chairman
Dept. of Psychology
Rockland Community College
Suffern, New York

Nelson, Roger E., Student
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Nesmith, Donald J.
Graduate Student
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

*Nichols, W. Eugene
Assoc. Dean of Students
Georgia Tech.
Atlanta, Georgia

Nowak, Dan
Asst. Dean of Students
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Nudd, T. Roger
Assoc. Dean of Students
University of California
Los Angeles, California

O'Connor, Brian R.
Educational Counselor
Geneva College
Beaver Falls, Pa.

O'Connor, John
Asst. Dean of Students
State University College
Cortland, New York

Ogden, G. Barton
Asst. to the Dean of Men
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Ohl, Ronald E.
Assistant Dean of Men
Elmhurst College
Elmhurst, Illinois

*Okunlola, Joseph A.
Administrative Intern
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia

O'Neill, Dan, Rev., C.S.C.
Asst. Vice President
Student Affairs
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Orr, James D., Jr.
Counselor in Residence
Rutgers
New Brunswick, New Jersey

O'Zee, William F.
Dean of Men
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

*Park, Eldon E.
Teaching Associate
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Parker, John M., Dean of
Student Personnel Services
Onondaga Community College
Syracuse, New York

Parr, Preston
Dean of Student Life
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Patterson, Robert O.
Asst. Dean of Men
Lycoming College
Williamsport, Pennsylvania

Payne, C. Keith, Rev., Secretary
for Work with College & Univer-
sity Students, Central Atlantic
Area Council of YMCA's
Newark, New Jersey

Pearlstein, Morton H.
Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity
Long Beach, New York

Perry, Benjamin L., Professor
Florida A. & M. University
Tallahassee, Florida

Peterson, Marvin W.
Assistant Dean, Harvard Graduate
School of Business Administration
Boston, Massachusetts

Phillips, Richard M.
Dean of Students
Gallaudet College
Washington, D. C.

Potter, Kenneth
Assistant Dean of Men
Muskingum College
New Concord, Ohio

Pifer, Andrew J.
Public Relations Officer
Erie County Technical Institute
Amherst, New York

Pratt, Earle W., Jr.
Assistant Dean of Students
State University College
Cortland, New York

Pugh, Benny J., Director of
Student Activities
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

Putzel, Max J., Associate
Dean of Undergraduate Students
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

File, K. Richard
Residence Counselor
DePauw University
Greencastle, Indiana

Quay, William L., Assistant
Dean of Student Life
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

*Quinn, Hugh A.
Dean of Students
State University of New York
Canton, New York

Raulerson, Lewis A.
Associate Dean of Students
State University of New York
Morrisville, New York

Renneisen, Charles M.
Dean of Men
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

Ridpath, Sarah E.
Dean of Student Affairs
Greenville College
Greenville, Illinois

Rinfret, Melvyn P.
Director of Housing
Rochester Institute of Tech.
Rochester, New York

Risch, Thomas J.
Residence Hall Director
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

Rishel, Darrell F.
Dean of Students
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania

Ritter, Donald B., Graduate
Residence Hall Advisor
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Roach, Virgil, Rev., S.J.
Asst. Director of Education
Jesuit Educational Association
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Robinson, Eugene E.
Associate Dean of Students
Austin College
Sherman, Texas

Robinson, Madeline M.
Assistant Dean of Students
New York City Community College
Brooklyn, New York

Root, Reginald D., Dean of Men
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Rose, C. H., Dean of Students
Curry College
Milton, Massachusetts

Ross, Samuel M., Dean of Men
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

Ryan, Aylmer
Student Affairs Division
University of Alberta
Alberta, Canada

Sales, Robert C., Asst. Dean
University of Delaware
Newark, New Jersey

*Salisch, Marc S.
Director of Student Activities
Pace College
New York, New York

Samuelson, J. Arthur
Dean of Men
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Sasaki, Edwin, Assistant
Director of Residence
Towson State College
Baltimore, Maryland

Scanapico, Anthony J.
Program Supervisor
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Scanlon, Joseph
National Executive Director
Alpha Phi Omega
Washington, D. C.

Schaffer, I. W., Dean
Division of Student Affairs
Wisconsin State University
Whitewater, Wisconsin

Schmidt, Alvin R., Dean of Men
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

Schroeder, Fred W., Jr.
Asst. Dean of Men
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Schultz, James P., Vice President,
Student Affairs
Capital University
Columbus, Ohio

Schwobel, Carl E.
Student & Head Resident
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio

Scott, D. Dean
Asst. Dean of Students
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

Scott, Warren B., Student
Personnel Counselor
Jamestown Community College
Jamestown, New York

Scully, James A.
Assistant Dean of Men
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

Serra, Joseph R.
Asst. Dean of Men
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

*Sharkey, Stuart J., Assistant
to Director of Residence
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Sharpton, C. T., Vice President
for Student Affairs
University of Alabama
University, Alabama

Shaw, Sue G., Director of
Student Activities
The American University
Washington, D. C.

Sheehan, Charles J., Asst.
Director, Student Affairs
New Mexico Institute of Mining
and Technology
Socorro, New Mexico

Sheehy, Stephen I., Brother
Dean of Men
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio

Sherburne, Richard F., S.J.
Dean of Students
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Sidar, Alexander G., Jr.
Dean of Student Life
Waynesburg College
Waynesburg, Pennsylvania

Sikes, Walter W.
Assoc. Dean of Students
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio

Sininger, Rollin A.
Asst. Dean of Students
The University of Texas
Galveston, Texas

*Slade, Irving L., Chairman,
Department of Student Personnel
Queensborough Community College
City University of New York
Bayside, New York

Smith, David W., Asst. Coordinator,
Student Personnel Serv.
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey

Smith, Hal R., Student
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Smith, Harry R., Resident Dir.
Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

Smith, Herbert E., Director Student Personnel Services Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana	Strick, Dale E., Coordinator of Student Activities Carnegie Institute of Tech. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
*Smith, J. Towner, Dean of Men Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan	Stripling, Robert O. Professor of Education University of Florida Gainesville, Florida
Smith, Leonard B. Dean of Students Monroe Community College Rochester, New York	Strom, Stan D., Head Resident University of Dayton Dayton, Ohio
Speir, F. Leslie Dean of Student Services Lorain County Community Coll. Lorain, Ohio	Tatham, David Assistant Dean of Men Syracuse University Syracuse, New York
Sprandel, Dorian Graduate Resident Adviser Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan	Taylor, Sylvia, Coordinator of Residence Programs Trenton State College Trenton, New Jersey
*Stafford, Edward E. Assoc. Dean of Students University of Illinois Champaign, Illinois	Taylor, Wallace W., Jr. Dean of Men Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, Ohio
Stafford, John W. Advisor of Men University of Akron Akron, Ohio	Thorn, Gordon R., Associate Director Student Affairs West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia
Stamatakis, Louis C. Dean of Student Services Grand Valley State College Allendale, Michigan	Tibbits, Stephen Graduate Student State University of New York Oswego, New York
Stanley, George H., Assoc. Director of Student Personnel University of Bridgeport Bridgeport, Connecticut	Tilley, David C. Dean of Students State University of New York Stony Brook, New York
Steffl, James, Dean of Men Iowa Wesleyan College Mt. Pleasant, Iowa	Tolino, Vincent H. Assistant Dean State University of New York Farmingdale, New York
Storch, Champ R. Asst. Dean of Men Penn State University University Park, Pennsylvania	Towner, Richard J., Coordi- nator of Student Activities Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, Ohio
Stormer, Jay R. Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania	

Tripp, Philip A., Specialist for Student Services U.S. Office of Education Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare Washington, D. C.	Walls, A. Stephen, Director of Student Activities Rochester Institute of Tech. Rochester, New York
Trotta, Vincent G. Assoc. Dean of Students State University of New York Alfred, New York	Walsh, J. Francis, Rev. Brother Dean of Men St. Mary's College Winona, Minnesota
Troy, Howard C. Assistant Dean of Students Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania	Waters, Donald E. Residence Hall Director Ball State University Muncie, Indiana
Urban, Larry L., Student Ohio University Athens, Ohio	Watkins, James V., Assistant Director Student Affairs West Virginia University Morgantown, West Virginia
Vander Lind, James, Student Ohio University Athens, Ohio	Weaver, Richard A. Assistant Dean of Men The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio
Van Dusen, William D. Wayne State University Detroit, Michigan	*Webb, O. K., Jr., Assistant Dean of Student Affairs Appalachian State Teachers Coll. Boone, North Carolina
Van Wart, Louis, Director of Student Activities Suffolk County Community Coll. Selden, New York	Weisblatt, Melvin L., Student Ohio University Athens, Ohio
Voldseth, Edward Dean of Students State College of Iowa Cedar Falls, Iowa	*Welles, John C. Director of Housing University of Massachusetts Amherst, Massachusetts
Volkwein, J. Fredericks Director Men's Residences Harpur College Binghamton, New York	Wettstein, Joseph A. Director of Student Personnel Northern State College Aberdeen, South Dakota
Walker, Charles H. Dean of Student Affairs Miami Dade Junior College Miami, Florida	Whalen, Douglas Nassau Community College Garden City, New York
Walle, Richard Vern, Dean of Guidance and Counseling Champlain College Burlington, Vermont	Whatley, Richard J. Dean of Men Ursinus College Collegeville, Pennsylvania

Whetstone, Wood K. Dean of Men Lambuth College Jackson, Tennessee	Wolf, Dan B. Work-Study Coordinator Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana
Whitaker, Raymond Asst. Dean of Students Bowling Green State Univ. Bowling Green, Ohio	Wright, William C., Assistant Dir. of Student Personnel Georgetown University Washington, D. C.
Whittaker, Ray, Director Student Activities Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Wurz, Shirley E. Dean of Students State University of New York Alfred, New York
Widmar, Gary E. Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida	Yarosz, Edward J. Asst. Dean of Students Newark College of Engineering Newark, New Jersey
Weiner, Michael J. Student Body President Rutgers College New Brunswick, New Jersey	Yeo, J. Wendell, Vice President Student Affairs Boston University Boston, Massachusetts
Wildy, Charles H., Dean of Men University of So. Florida Tampa, Florida	Young, Donald F., Dean of Men Loyola College of Montreal Montreal, Canada
Wilkinson, John A., Associate Dean of the College Coe College Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Young, George W., Counselor Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida
Willenbrock, B. D. Dean of Students State University of New York Farmingdale, New York	Yuthas, Jack, Vice President for Student Affairs Wisconsin State University Stevens Point, Wisconsin
Williams, Arleigh, Dean of Men University of California Berkeley, California	Zades, Stamos O. Dean of Students Staten Island Community Coll. Staten Island, New York
*Wilson, Gordon Associate Dean of Students Fresno State College Fresno, California	Zaleski, Joseph F., Asst. Dean, Student General Affairs Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois
Windisch, Paul N. Head Resident Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, Ohio	Zelikovsky, Barry, Asst. Secy. Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity New York, New York
Wisthuff, Donald J. Residence Hall Counselor Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois	Zimmerman, Kurt K. Program Director Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, Ohio

GUESTS AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Alberstadt, Norman, Dr.
Medical Officer
Food & Drug Administration
Arlington, Virginia

Anderson, Wayne
Ass'n. of American Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Bedell, Ralph, Dr.
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Bennett, John L.
Council for the Advancement
of Small Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Borton, Hugh, Dr., President
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania

Bowman, James L.
Divn. of Financial Aids
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Braisted, Paul, Dr.
The Hazen Foundation
New Haven, Connecticut

Byrnes, Nano, UFCCS
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Cardozo, Michael H., Dr.
Assn. of American Law Schools
Washington, D. C.

Chandler, Barbara, Dr.
Natl. Institute of Mental Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Chatelain, Jo Anne
Sec. Asso. of Collegiate
Schools of Architects
Washington, D. C.

Clark, Lois, Secy.-Treasurer
Natl. Council of Administrative
Women in Education
Washington, D. C.

Sister Columba, A.N.D.
Trinity College
Notre Dame de Namur
Education Association
Washington, D. C.

Cornett, R. Orin, Dr.
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Cosby, Betty, Dr., Professor
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Cowan, John L.
Technical Director
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Deakins, Clarence, Dr.
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Dennis, Lawrence, Dr.
Director
Commission on Academic Affairs
American Council on Education
Washington, D. C.

Duncan, William H.
Dean of Students
Millersville State College
Millersville, Pennsylvania

Dyke, Lester M., Dr.
American Collegiate Health Assn.
Coral Gables, Florida

Elkins, Wilson H., Dr.
President
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Estrin, Herman A., Dr.
Newark College of Engineering
Newark, New Jersey

Gideonse, Harry D., President
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York

Glashagel, Jerry
Natl. Student Council of YMCA
Urbana, Illinois

Godard, James M., Dr.
Council of Protestant
Colleges and Universities
Washington, D. C.

Gottlieb, Alvin, Genl. Counsel
Dept. of Health, Education
and Welfare
Food and Drug Administration

Greeley, Andrew, Rev.
Natl. Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Green, Edith
United States Congress
Washington, D. C.

Grigsby, Ernestine
National Pan Hellenic
Landover, Maryland

Hager, Walter E., Dr.
Assn. of State Colleges & Univ.
Washington, D. C.

Hansen, Douglas
Division of Field Operations
Food and Drug Administration
Arlington, Virginia

Harris, Arthur, Dr.
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Hefferlin, J. B.
Natl. Commission on Accrediting
Washington, D. C.

Hill, Alfred T., Dr.
Council for the Advancement
of Small Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Hitchcock, Arthur A.
Amer. Personnel & Guidance Assn.
Washington, D. C.

Hitt, James K.
Amer. Assn. of Collegiate
Registrars & Admissions Officers
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Hoskin, Garlin, Dr.
The Hazen Foundation
New Haven, Connecticut

Sister Mary Jeanne, R.S.M.
Councilor General
Bethesda, Maryland

Johnson, Thomas D.
President, ASG
West Lafayette, Indiana

Jorgensen, Albert N., Dr.
Director of Washington Office
International Institute of
Education
Washington, D. C.

Josephson, Marvin C., Dr.
American Church Institute
Executive Council Protestants
Episcopal Church
New York, New York

Kahn, Benjamin M., Dr.
B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation
Washington, D. C.

Kirk, Barbara
Amer. College Personnel Assn.
University of California
Berkeley, California

Krovitz, Robert, Vice Pres.
Natl. Interfraternity Conference
New York, New York

Kurtz, Don, President
Natl. Newman Club Federation
Washington, D. C.

Lacy, O. W.
Professor of Psychology
Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

Landreth, Jerry
Assn. of Student Governments
Central Missouri State Coll.
Warrensburg, Missouri

Langevin, Thomas
Research Project Director
St. Louis, Missouri

Laster, Harold, Dr.
American Civil Liberties Union
Washington, D. C.

Leslie, John W., Dr.
Amer.College Public Relations
Association
Washington, D. C.

Lolita, Ernest
Washington Post
Washington, D. C.

Mahn, Robert E., Registrar
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Malloy, Edward
State University of New York
Stony Brook, L.I., New York

Malmborg, Eleanor D., Dr.
American Assn. of Univ.Women
Washington, D. C.

Sister Janice Marie
Education Association
Washington, D. C.

Sister Jean Marie, O.P.
Dean of St. Catherine College
St. Catherine, Kentucky

Mother Stella Maris, D.M.
Asst. to the Mother General
Bethesda, Maryland

Mastin, Jon D.,
President, IAEC
Akron, Ohio

McDonald, Finian, Rev., O.S.B.
Dean of Men
St. Johns University
Collegeville, Minnesota

McKee, R. C., Dr.
Dept. of Health, Educ.& Welfare
Washington, D. C.

Monypenny, Phillip M.
Chairman - Committee S
Amer.Assn.of Univ. Professors
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Moore, James
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Morse, John F., Dr.
Amer.Council of Education Dir.
Commission of Legislative Affairs
Washington, D. C.

Nabrit, James M., Jr.,
President
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

Noble, Hubert C., Dr.
Commission on Higher Education
New York, New York

Parkhurst, Nelson H.
Council of Student
Personnel Associations
Registrar, Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Peterson, Martha, Dr.
Natl. Assn. of Women Deans
and Counselors
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Pollitt, Daniel,
Professor of Political Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Platt, Patricia
National School Public
Reactions Association
Washington, D. C.

Power, Daniel E., Rev., S.J.
Director of Public Relations
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

Price, Ernest, Jr.
Assn. Executive of National
Student Council of YMCA
New York, New York

Robbins, Stephen J. M.
President, USNSA
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Russell, John, Dr.
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Sanders, Edward
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Scorsone, Gloriann
National Federation of
Catholic College Students
Washington, D. C.

Shannon, Albert, Rev., O.S.A.
Executive Director
Augustinian Educational Assn.
Villanova, Pennsylvania

Shaul, Dennis
Harvard Law School
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Shelden, Miriam
Council of Student
Personnel Associations
Dean of Women
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Sherburne, Phillip
USNSA
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Smith, G. Kerry
Assn. for Higher Education
Washington, D. C.

Stewart, Donald
Univ. of Alabama Law School
University, Alabama

Stewart, Richard
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Stripling, Robert O.
Professor of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Swanson, Gordon I., Dr.
Pres., Phi Delta Kappa
Univ. of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota

Thackrey, Russell I.
Assn. of State Universities &
Land Grant Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Tripp, Philip, Dr.
Specialist for Student Services
Dept. of Health, Educ. & Welfare
Washington, D. C.

Tschechtelin, James, President
Nat'l. Assn. of College and
University Residence Halls
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

*Van Alstyne, William
Professor of Law
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Vance, Forrest, Dr.
Administrative Officer
Amer. Psychological Assn.
Washington, D. C.

Van Dusen, William D.
Director of Scholarships
and Financial Aids
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

Van Waes, Robert,
Professor
Washington, D. C.

Vasicko, Sally Jo, President
Intercollegiate Association
of Women Students
University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington

Waldrop, Robert S.
Professor of Psychology
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Weinstein, Howard I., Dr.
Director, Division of Medical
Review, Food & Drug Admin.
Arlington, Virginia

White, Helen, Dr.
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Whiting, Albert N., Dr.
Dean
Morgan State College
National Assn. of College
Deans and Registrars
Baltimore, Maryland

Wickey, Gould, Dr.
Executive Director
National Lutheran Educational
Conference
Washington, D. C.

Wolfe, Deborah P.
Education Chief
House Committee on Education
U.S. Congress
Washington, D. C.

Wormald, F.
Vice President
Assn. of American Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Yakowitz, Morris
Director, Division
of Case Supervision
Food and Drug Administration
Arlington, Virginia

Yokie, J. A.
Natl. Association of College
& University Residence Halls
National Advisor
Student Housing Office
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Zwingle, J. L.
Assn. of Governing Boards of
Universities and Colleges
Washington, D. C.

* Denotes Wives in Attendance

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meeting	Year	President	Place	President	Secretary
1	1919	6	Madison, Wisconsin	S.H. Goodnight	L.A. Strauss
2	1920	9	Urbana, Illinois	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
3	1921	16	Iowa City, Iowa	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
4	1922	20	Lexington, Ky.	E.E. Nicholson	S.H. Goodnight
5	1923	17	Lafayette, Ind.	Stanley Coulter	E.E. Nicholson
6	1924	29	Ann Arbor, Mich.	J.A. Bursley	E.E. Nicholson
7	1925	31	Chapel Hill, N.C.	Robert Rienow	F.F. Bradshaw
8	1926	46	Minneapolis, Minn.	C.R. Melcher	F.F. Bradshaw
9	1927	43	Atlanta, Georgia	Floyd Field	F.F. Bradshaw
10	1928	50	Boulder, Colorado	S.H. Goodnight	F.M. Dawson
11	1929	75	Washington, D.C.	C.B. Culver	V.I. Moore
12	1930	64	Fayetteville, Ark.	J.W. Armstrong	V.I. Moore
13	1931	83	Knoxville, Tenn.	W.J. Sanders	V.I. Moore
14	1932	40	Los Angeles, Cal.	V.I. Moore	D.H. Gardner
15	1933	55	Columbus, Ohio	C.E. Edmondson	D.H. Gardner
16	1934	61	Evanston, Ill.	H.E. Lobdell	D.H. Gardner
17	1935	56	Baton Rouge, La.	B.A. Tolbert	D.H. Gardner
18	1936	92	Philadelphia, Pa.	W.E. Alderman	D.H. Gardner
19	1937	80	Austin, Texas	D.S. Lancaster	D.H. Gardner
20	1938	164	Madison, Wisconsin	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
21	1939	87	Roanoke, Virginia	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
22	1940	58	Albuquerque, N.Mex.	F.J. Findlay	F.H. Turner
23	1941	100	Cincinnati, Ohio	J.J. Thompson	F.H. Turner
24	1942	114	Urbana, Illinois	L.S. Corbett	F.H. Turner
25	1943	101	Columbus, Ohio	J.A. Park	F.H. Turner
26	1944	96	Chicago, Illinois	J.H. Julian	F.H. Turner
27	1945	Due to	Office of Defense Transportation	No Meeting held	
28	1946	142	Lafayette, Indiana	Earl J. Miller	F.H. Turner
29	1947	170	Ann Arbor, Mich.	Arno Nowotny	F.H. Turner
30	1948	173	Dallas, Texas	E.L. Cloyd	F.H. Turner
31	1949	217	Highland Park, Ill.	J.H. Newman	F.H. Turner
32	1950	210	Williamsburg, Va.	L.K. Neidlinger	F.H. Turner
33	1951	222	St. Louis, Mo.	W.P. Lloyd	F.H. Turner
34	1952	180	Colo. Springs, Colo.	A. Blair Knapp	F.H. Turner
35	1953	245	East Lansing, Mich.	V.F. Spathelf	F.H. Turner
36	1954	231	Roanoke, Virginia	R.M. Strozier	F.H. Turner
37	1955	230	Lafayette, Ind.	J.H. Stibbs	F.H. Turner
38	1956	201	Berkeley, Cal.	J.E. Hocutt	F.H. Turner
39	1957	231	Durham, N. Carolina	F.C. Baldwin	F.H. Turner
40	1958	306	French Lick, Ind.	D.M. DuShane	F.H. Turner
41	1959	303	Boston, Mass.	F.H. Turner	C.W. Knox
42	1960	367	Columbus, Ohio	H.D. Winbigler	C.W. Knox
43	1961	303	Colo. Springs, Colo.	W.S. Guthrie	C.W. Knox
44	1962	408	Philadelphia, Pa.	F.H. Weaver	C.W. Knox
45	1963	383	Evanston, Ill.	J.C. Clevenger	C.W. Knox
46	1964	510	Detroit, Mich.	J.C. McLeod	C.W. Knox
47	1965	864	Washington, D.C.	V.R. Yanitelli	C.W. Knox